A THREEFOLD ANSWER VNTO THE THIRD PART OF A CERTAINE TRIOBOLAR TREATISE of *Three* ſuppoſed *Conuerſions of England* to the moderne *Romiſh Religion publiſhed by Rob. Parſons vnder the continued Maske of N. D.*

The firſt Part whereof conteineth a defence of the Martyrs and Confeſſors of the true faith againſt the hereſies and impieties of Poperie, and of their acts, ſayings, and ſufferings by him wickedly traduced.

The ſecond examineth ſome part of the Romiſh Martyrologies and Legends, and of the impious doctrine and practiſe of Papiſts in worſhipping of Saints and Angels, by him weakely defended.

The third refuteth his exorbitant Diſcourſes, relations, and obſeruations, and diſcouereth his groſſe leaſings, falſities, fooleries and other enormities.

PSAL. 36.
The words of his mouth are iniquitie and deceit.

PROV. 12.
The bowels of the wicked are full of cruelty.

LONDON,
Printed for IOHN NORTON.
1606.

XUM

XUM

TO THE MOST REuerend Father in God, *Richard* by the prouidence of God Archbiſhop of Canterburie, Metropolitan and Primate of all England.

WHEN I firſt vndertooke to anſwer the third part of Parſons *his impertinent Treatiſe of* Three Conuerſions of England, *as he ſtileth it; I did then (moſt Reuerend Father) eſteeme the labour very light and eaſie. For hauing already anſwered the two firſt parts, I thought there could be no great difficultie in refuting the third, being the remaines of the firſt and ſecond, they containing nothing but a fardle of verball and idle diſcourſes, and this being fraught onely with vaine cauils and calumniations againſt good men cruelly murthered by his bloudie conſorts, and fond and friuolous talke about calendring and worſhipping of Saints without all ſound proofe, and almoſt ſhew of probabilitie.*

But I had no ſooner entred into the worke, but I perceiued eaſily, that the further I paſſed forward in my anſwer, the more the labour began to grow. Not that it was hard or laborious to refell the impudent diſputes of this vaine man, but that to find out the vanitie of his reports, and the truth of the ſtorie, it was neceſſarie for me to make ſearch through all thoſe Authors, through which he ſeemed in the pilgrimage about

his Conuersions to haue trauelled. So it was needfull for me not onely to reade ouer the great volume of M. Foxes his historie concerning the Church, for the better examination of his slanderous imputations, but also to examine and peruse the Romane Martyrologie, the Lombardicall Legend, Surius, and Petrus De Natalibus, *Vsuardus, and other Legendarie Writers, Baronius, and Molanus his annotations vpon the Martyrologies, together with such authors as treat of the true worship of God, and the false and idolatrous worship of Saints and Angels, for the fuller discouerie of his false, erroneous, and leud doctrine and discourses. Matters not without time, labour, diligence, and paines in any good sort to be performed.*

Howbeit, to represse the insolencie of the aduersaries of truth, that, while their fellowes are making readie their traines, and whetting their swords to ouerwhelme the state and to shed the bloud of innocents, are busily occupied in spreading of errors and slanders; to defend the cause of the innocent, by these wicked sycophants most vniustly traduced; to maintaine truth, which by all meanes these suppostz of Satan haue impugned; to refell the idolatrous worship of Saints, which vnder colour of reuerence due to Martyrs, the seducing Iebusites seek to commend to the people; I haue thought, I could not better employ my labor, time, and spirits, then in the examining and censuring of the wicked spirit and leud discourse of this rinegued Iebusite. It had bene more wisedome for our aduersaries to haue conceiled those cruell murthers and massacres, which their auncestors haue committed vpon Christs true Martyrs. And Christian modestie, if any sparke thereof had bene in them, would haue taught them, to haue passed by the ridiculous and monstrous lyes of their Legends and Martyrologies in silence. Finally, nothing doth lesse become Christians, then to call vpon the Popes new created Saints, then

to worſhip the rotten bones and ragges of vncouth and ſtrange creatures, and to offer ſacrifice in the honor of Saints, and Angels: and laſtly, to ſweare by them, and to confeſſe their ſinnes vnto them. But ſeeing Parſons *wold needs once againe bring vpon the ſtage thoſe tragicall acts, which his forefathers haue againſt all religion and humanitie committed againſt true Chriſtians, and was not aſhamed to commend vnto Chriſtians both the ſhameleſſe lyes of the Legends, and the ſuperſtitious and idolatrous worſhip of Saints practiſed by the Romiſh ſynagogue; he muſt haue patience not onely to heare the cruelties of the Romiſh Inquiſitors cenſured, but alſo to ſee his owne ſuperſtition, errors, and folly noted and refuted. He* boaſteth in his owne wickedneſſe, *as Doeg did, and reioyceth,* that he hath done miſchiefe. *But God will reuenge the cauſe of the innocent, and all good men will reioyce to ſee the miſchiefe deuiſed by* Parſons *againſt others, to fall vpon his owne pate.*

I need not to vſe many words in diſcouering the rage and malice of this helhound in barking againſt the memories of holy Martyrs. Nor will it be expected, that I ſhould exhort true Chriſtians to honor the fortitude, heroicall courage and conſtant ſufferings of ſuch as teſtified the truth againſt the falſhood and abominations of Antichriſt. Only I will vſe the words of the Wiſe man, Eccleſ. 44. Sapientiam eorum narrent populi, & laudem eorum nuntiet Eccleſia. Let the people declare the wiſedome, and the Church ſet foorth their praiſe.

Finally, it were preſumption for me, if I ſhould tell your Grace, how much it behooueth the Magiſtrate to prouide, that the State take no harme by ſuch, as ſeeke to blow vp the State. And how manfully both the Magiſtrate and all Chriſtian Biſhops and Miniſters of Gods word ought to reſiſt theſe vn-

derminers of Religion and State. There is no man, that hath more trauelled in diſcouering theſe mens trecherous and irreligious doctrine then your Grace, or is better acquainted with their peſtilentiall and venimous humors. I will therfore forbeare to vrge this point any further, referring the ſame to your Graces graue conſideration, and to other our ſuperiors. That which belonged to me I haue done my indeuour to performe. I haue expreſſed the bloudie crueltie of Papiſts in murthering Gods Saints, their malice in perſecuting the memory of the dead, and their impietie and abuſes in worſhipping the Images, reliques and ſoules of ſuppoſed Saints departed. Matters (I hope) ſufficient to moue all good men to hate their crueltie and impietie, and diligently to ſearch for truth, and to embrace it.

Vouchſafe therefore, moſt Reuerend Father, to accept of theſe my ſlender labors, farre inferiour, I confeſſe, to your honorable fauors, and yet a plaine teſtimoniall of my loyall affection, and thankfulneſſe to your Grace. And as hitherto you haue painefully and diligently trauelled in diſcouering the wickedneſſe and trecherie of Popiſh Religion; ſo ſtill continue your godly endeauours in ſetting foorth the vndoubted truth of the Catholike and Apoſtolike faith, neuer ceaſing vntill the rootes of all impietie be pulled vp, and the profeſſors of the hereticall and trecherous doctrine of Poperie be either conuerted by Gods grace, or confounded by his iuſtice.

Your Graces in all Chriſtian and
dutifull affection:

MATT. SVTCLIFFE.

The

The Præface to the Reader.

THE cruell perſecutions of the Popes of *Rome*, and their complices, that of late times haue murthered and maſſacred ſo many innocent Chriſtians, and that ſo trecherouſly and perfidiouſly, being ſo deteſtable and odious, not only to their aduerſaries, but alſo to all moderate men of their owne Religion, and ſo contrarie to the practiſe of the Church of *Chriſt*, and manners of the auncient Biſhops of *Rome*, as nothing more; many do not a little wonder, Chriſtian Reader, why the Papiſts now by their agents ſhould beginne to renew the memorie of ſuch cruell executions, tortures, murders, and maſſacres, as the bloudie Inquiſitors of late times haue practiſed for the maintenance of their owne impieties, and the ſuppreſſing of the profeſſors of truth. For albeit the forehead of the whore of *Babylon* be hard and ſhameleſſe; yet humane wiſedome, and common reaſon might haue taught her, and her louers, by all meanes to conceile and ſuppreſſe the memorie and mention of all ſuch acts and records as any way may teſtifie their wicked, barbarous, and vnchriſtian proceedings. *Verberari proprium Chriſtianorum eſt, flagellare autem Chriſtianos Pilati & Caiphæ officia ſunt. To endure ſtripes is the propertie of Chriſtians,* (ſaith Athanaſius in Epiſt. ad ſolit. vit. agentes) *but to ſcourge Chriſtians, is the office of Pilate and Caiphas.* Further, it is an inhumane part, to rake in the aſhes of the dead, and to raile vpon ſuch as themſelues haue ſlaine. οὐχ ὅσιον φθιμένοισι &c. *Homer* if none elſe might tell them, that *It was impious to inſult ouer the dead.* They may percaſe accompt it pietie, to rayle vpon men executed for contrarie Religion. But we may ſay vnto them, as *Tertullian de Reſur. carn.* ſaid ſometime to men of their humor. *O pietatem de crudelitate ludentem! O goodly pietie, that maketh a ſport in crueltie! Who* (ſaith Chryſologus Cal. Ian.) *doth make a ieaſt at ſacriledge? who doth laugh at impietie?* Sure none, but

ſuch as declare themſelues void of Religion and pietie.

Yet ſuch is the iuſt iudgement of God vpon our aduerſaries, that as men ſtrucken with amazement, without all ſhame they raile vpon innocent Chriſtians, which moſt iniuriouſly and cruelly themſelues haue murthered and perſecuted, and without all conſideration of reaſon, honeſtie, or humanitie haue begun to rippe vp matters, either to many not knowne, or not thought vpon before; which being once knowne muſt needes conuince them of iniuſtice, impietie, and barbarous crueltie. And ſo while *Chriſtians* were ſilent, theſe bloudie Maſſacrers haue ſet on ſome of their owne ſect, to publiſh their owne infamie, and to proclaime it to the world. Among the reſt one *Harpsfeld* vnder the name of *Copus*, and of late *Rob. Parſons* an Engliſhman by birth, but a profeſſed enemie of *England*, and a fugitiue out of his countrie, haue ſhewed themſelues moſt forward. This *Parſons* is by his followers called a *Ieſuite*, but is an Apoſtate from Religion, and an vtter enemie of that doctrine which *Ieſus* taught, and a ſlaue of *Antichriſt*. By diuers libels publiſhed by him, we find that he is a fellow nuſled and brought vp in libelling and rayling: and therefore maruell the leſſe, if he haue rayled and libelled againſt the Confeſſors, or Martyrs, which haue ſuffered or died for that truth, againſt which he, like a renegate from Religion, moſt rudely hath long barked. *In Afris neſcio quod non malum*, ſaith *Saluianus*. But we may ſay the ſame more iuſtly againſt the *Iebuſites* the onely, and principall brewers of miſchiefe in our time. This *Parſons* ſpeaking of thoſe Martyrs, which of late time haue giuen their bloud for witneſſe of the truth againſt the ſynagogue of Antichriſt, ſome he chargeth with treaſon, others with ſacriledge and theeuerie, others with Witcherie and Necromancie, and all of them with obſtinacie and hereſie.

So the chiefe Prieſts and Phariſees (*Mat.* 27.) hauing proſecuted our Sauiour to the death, do raile on him *as a ſeducer*. The heathen perſecutors likewiſe murthered the profeſſors of *Chriſtian* Religion, and railed on them, as ſuperſtitious, & wicked perſons. *Afflicti ſupplicijs Chriſtiani* (ſaith Suetonius in Nerone) *genus hominum ſuperſtitionis nouæ, ac maleficæ*. Tacitus alſo ſheweth,

ſheweth, that they were both killed, and mocked. *Addita*, ſaith he, *peremtibus ludibria.* This likewiſe doth *Parſons* endeuour againſt late Martyrs. And becauſe Maſter *Foxe* out of records and by good and authenticall teſtimonies doth conuince the bloody maſſacring Papiſts of notorious cruelty and impiety, his third part of his three pretended *Conuerſions of England*, is ſpecially directed againſt him, and his laborious collection of *Acts and Monuments of the Church.*

In that booke alſo he ſpendeth much idle talke about the worſhip of Saints, and ancient and later Calendars, trying, if by any meanes he could bring back the forelorne ſuperſtition and falſe worſhip of the ſynagogue of Rome into his owne country, from whence it hath bene happily and long baniſhed.

This rayling libell, for that it conteineth matter of diſgrace not only to the Church of *England*, of which I am a member, but alſo to the holy Martyrs and Confeſſors that haue ſuffred for that truth, which we all profeſſe, and whom all true Chriſtians haue cauſe for their zeale and fortitude to reuerence, I haue thought good to runne ouer, as my leiſure ſerued. I haue alſo examined the *Roman* Calendar, and ſhewed, how little it maketh for our aduerſaries aduantage. Finally I haue anſwered his extrauagant diſcourſes both concerning the worſhip of Saints and other matters drawne violently into this treatiſe of Three Conuerſions.

All this I preſent to thy fauorable reading, beſeeching God, that as he hath diſcouered vnto vs the filthineſſe and abhominations of the whore of *Babylon* in the idolatrous worſhip of Saints, and the bloody cruelty of Papiſts againſt the profeſſors of the truth, in burning, poyſoning, killing and maſſacring all that withſtand them, and their ſhameleſſe impudencie in boaſting of their owne wickednes and cruelty, ſo all of vs may be carefull to preuent their treacherous deuices, that their long ſetled malice take no effect, and zealous to withſtand their ſuperſtitious and idolatrous practiſes, that Gods true worſhip may ſtill continue, and be more and more embraced amongſt vs.

The

The first booke conteining a defence of the Martyrs and Confessors of *Christs Church against the heresies and impieties* of Popery, and of their actions and sayings, by *Robert Parsons* in his third part of Three Conuersions wickedly traduced and slandred.

CHAP. I.

A defence of Master Wicleffe, Sir Roger Acton, *and other godly Martyrs, and Confessors referred in the Calendar for the time of their suffrings or tryall to the moneth of* Ianuary.

WHen superstition and ignorance of true religion had possessed the greatest part both of this land & other countries adioyning, then it pleased God to vse Master Wicleffe as an instrument to discouer the same both to his owne countrymen, and to others. Against this man therefore, as a principall instrument to lay open the impieties of Babylon, Robert Parsons doth begin first to barke. But his exceptions are of that nature, that we are not more to esteeme them then the yalping of a mangy curre. First he denyeth him to be a Martyr, and next he chargeth him with ambition. The reasons he alledgeth for the first are these, that he was neither put to death, nor imprisoned for Religion, and for that he held diuers opinions different frō the Church of England, and by the Church of Rome condemned for heresies. But Cyprian *lib.4. epist.6.* sheweth vs,

vs, that they are Martyrs, who by any meanes either publikely or priuatly are brought to their end for Religion. *Nec minor est*, saith he, *Martyris gloria non publicè, nec inter multos periisse, cum pereundi causa sit propter Christum perire.* Neither is the glory of a Martyr lesse, if he dye not publikely or in the view of many, when the occasion of his death, is the profession of Christ. But that by the persecution of Papists Wicleffe was driuen to and fro, and sooner by that meanes came to his end, there is no question. Furthermore Iohn Baptiste in the Legend is reputed a Martyr, for that his bones were burnt after his death. *Quasi secundum Martyrium patiatur*, sayth Iames de Voragine, *quando ipse in suis ossibus concrematur.* Why then should not Master Wicleffe haue like fauour, his bones being digged out of his graue, and burned after his death? Further it is apparent, that he was arrested and imprisoned, and was diuers times conuented by his aduersaryes. But had he not bene imprisoned by them; yet it is sufficient that he was cruelly pursued by them, and persecuted: which argueth their malice, and this good mans Martyrdome. Neither did he hold any thing that might depriue him of this glory, especially considering that the errors supposed to be holden by him were rather forced collections made by his aduersaryes, and slanderous imputations, then points of doctrine taught or defended by him, as shall appeare further in the Calendar of Parsons calumniations and lyes. The crime of ambition obiected against Master Wicleffe was so farre from him, that most of his aduersaryes do rather charge him with affectation of pouerty. Furthermore if he taught that Bishops were not to possesse temporalties, what reason had he to desire a Bishoprick, as he is charged by Parsons? The proues of these obiections are absurd and ridiculous.

First, Parsons alledgeth, that Master Luther spoke contemptibly of Wicleffe, & held him for an heretike, as Cochleus *in vita Lutheri*, and Surius *in hist. an. Do.* 1517. and 1518. do testifie. But these two lying companions are no sufficient witnesses, albeit they should testifie against that good man.

Further-

Furthermore it cannot be shewed, that they say any such thing either of Luther or Wicleffe. They say only that Luther held the Bohemians for schismaticks. But Cochleus in the same place doth salue this sore, and saith, that he blotted out afterward, what he first had written against them.

Secondly he bringeth in Melanchon *in epist. ad Miconium, & in Apolog. tit. de Human. tradit.* as misliking some of Wicleffs opinions. But he speaketh only by supposition, and in case he maintained such opinions, as are fathered vpon him. Beside that, suppose Maister Wicleffe should not haue discerned all the abuses of Popery, yet did he deserue commendation in teaching most things more purely then Papists. Parsons also alledgeth Melanchons common places *c. de Potest. Eccles.* whereas his common places haue no such title.

Thirdly he produceth Thomas Walsingham, and Waldensis to proue Wicleffe an heretike. But neither is the testimonie of enemies to be credited, nor do they well agree what opinions he held.

Fourthly to proue him ambitious he alledgeth Thomas Waldensis *tom.1. lib.3. c.66.* and *4. c.34.* and Polydore Virgil in his history of England. But neither doth Waldensis say, that he pretended very ambitiously the Bishopricke of Worcester, as this pretended Iesuite sayth, nor doth Polydore say more then Waldensis. *Fama similis volauit* saith Waldensis, speaking of this pretended pretence of Maister Wicleffe for the Bishoprick of Worcester, and this he saith *tom.1. lib.4. c.33.* Further *tom.1. lib.3.* there are not so many Chapters as Parsons alledgeth.

Fifthly he saith, that no man can deny, that wicked causes and motiues were euident in Wicleffe, that shall reade our English stories written not only by Papists, but by Protestants themselues. After that he citeth Holinshed, and Iohn Stow. But first Iohn Stow is a simple story writer, and a worse Protestant. Beside that, what he writeth he take out of Thomas Walsingham, a false lying Monke, & an Author, which hee vnderstode not. It is also well knowne that certaine crafty companions and enemies of Religion were

to

to much conuersant with him, to write truly in Wicleffes cause. But all this notwithstanding, there is nothing in Stow against Wicleffe which soundeth euill, but that which he is said to teach concerning the taking away of the temporalties from the Clergy. Master Holinshed hath not one word, that doth argue Master Wicleffe to haue bin stirred vp by wicked causes and motiues.

Finally he giueth out, that both Luther and Wicleffe began their doctrine vpon the same principles, motiues, and inductions of enuy, reuenge, ambition, and popular fauour, and that afterward they multiplied, altered and changed their opinions, as occasion fell out. But the first is nothing else but a malitious slander deuised by Wicleffes and Luthers enemies without all ground of truth, or iust cause of suspition. The second argueth not any inconstancy in either, but rather that they increased dayly more and more in knowledge, and saw further and further into the heresies and abuses of Popery. As for the articles obiected against Wicleffe in the conuenticle of Constance, it is no maruell if they differ from those that were obiected to him in England, nor if they both conteine matters false and scandalous. For they were obiected against him for the most part after his death, and collected by malitious enemyes, which suppressing his bookes imputed what they listed vnto him. The like course do the Papists now hold with Luther, Caluin, and others, albeit their bookes are extant, and although their slanders may be refuted by many witnesses.

Thus it appeareth, that this lying parasite hath no matter of moment to obiect against Master Wicleffe, which is not most easily auoyded. But when they two shall appeare before Christes tribunall seate, then shall the innocency of the one, and the malice of the other appeare more clearely. Then also shall it appeare, that Wicleffe is a true Martyr of Christ Iesus, both aliue and dead being persecuted by the Pope and his complices, and that Parsons is a wicked sycophant and slaue of Antichrist. In the meane while we see, what fauour the teachers of truth are to looke for at

Papists

Papists hands, who tosse such men from place to place, slander them, wrong them, and suffer them to rest neither aline, nor dead.

The next man, whom our aduersary calleth in question, is Sir Roger Acton Knight an earnest professor of that true doctrine, which Master Wicleffe taught, and a great fauorer of Christes poore persecuted flock in those times: for which cause, whatsoeuer was further pretended, he fell into disfauor of the popish prelates, and was by their procurement conuented, condemned and executed, as appeareth partly by the record of his enditement, and may probably be gathered out of Fabian, Hall, and others.

But sayth Parsons Chap. 5. He conspired King Henry the fift his death with Sir Iohn Oldcastle, and was taken in open rebellion against him in the field of Saint Giles by London, and was condemned of high treason first by priuat iudgement, then by Act of Parliament, and was drawne and hanged for the same. And this he proueth by ỹ testimony of Iohn Stow, a worthy Chronicler to set downe the noble acts of Taylers and Botchers, of which trade he was himselfe. But if this be a sound argument that he was thus condemned, then hath Parsons little to say in defence of his consorts, Campion, Sherwin, and other mutinous and seditious Massepriests, all of them conuicted, condemned, and executed for treason. Against Sir Roger and his consorts treason was obiected without all colour of reason. For first it cannot be proued, that either Sir Roger Acton, or his fellowes conferred, or were in company with Sir Iohn Oldcastle for diuers yeares before the time of this accident, for which they were accused, he being either in prison, or liuing in Wales. Secondly there is no cause alledged, why this company should either rebell, or seeke the death of the King, a man of such hope, and so well beloued of his subiects. Nay if, as is pretended, they sought to make Sir Iohn Oldcastle Regent; then is it not likely, they sought to kill the King, vpon whose death the end of his Lieutenancy or Regency would haue ensued. Thirdly the King and his brethern lying at Eltham,

it

it is an absurd thing to thinke, that such as meant to offer violence to their persons, should appoint the rendez-vous, or place of meeting on the other side of the water, and so neere to London. Fourthly, if they had made such a conspiracy, then there is no question, but they had leaders, ensignes, souldiers, and great troupes of men to execute the same. But these poore soules, that were charged with this rebellion and conspiracy, had none of all these things. May to shew, that they had no such forces or provisions as were requisite in such a case, they were apprehended by ordinary meanes, and without one blow giuen or taken. Finally, they seazed no townes, nor toke any place of aduantage, nor did any act, such as conspirators and leaguers against Princes are wont to do. The only act for which they were condemned was, their assembling together to heare Gods word, to receiue the Sacraments, and to do other acts of Religion contrary to the practise of Romish prelates, which by them was accounted treason. The very words and manner of the enditement also conteining diuers contradictions, impossibilities, and vntruths, may well serue to cleare them. For first, the commission giuen forth to endite them was dated the x. of Ianuary *anno* 1413. after the accompt of the Church of England, which was the Wednesday next after ỳ Epiphany. But that day it is said that twenty thousand rebels were met together in Saint Giles his field, which being so, no commission should haue gone forth to endite them, but rather to leuy forces to suppresse thẽ. Secondly, if any such enditement had bene framed and found, then the inrors names would haue bene annexed, which here is not done. Thirdly, the cause of their rebellion is pretended to be, to make Sir Iohn Oldcastle Regent. But what náded a Regent, when the King was in England, and not yet gone for France? Fourthly, these rebels are called people without a head: and yet in the same rolle they are charged with conspiring to make Sir Iohn Oldcastle their head. Parsons he saith they conspired with Sir Iohn Oldcastle. Fifthly, the number of the rebels is said to be twenty thousand. But it is not

probable

probable, that twenty thousand could be defeated by one bare enditement, and without striking one blow. Sixthly they say, they rose in rebellion priuatly, *priuatim insurgentes*, as if twenty thousand men could be gathered priuatly, priuily, or sodeinly. Seuenthly the Kings brethren were then called Dukes of Bedford and Gloceſter. But in the enditement they are called Thomas of Lancaſter, and Iohn of Lançaſter. Finally they are sayd to haue come riding to the place. But twenty thousand horsemen are not so easily leauied in England, and being leauied, are not so easily defeated. And very absurd it were to thinke, that they that came riding, could not haue rid away if they had bẽ too weake. So we see lyes agree not: and how, because the followers of Wicleffe were called traytors, their malitious enemies deuised matter against them, as if indede they had bẽn rebels and traytors.

Further the manner of their triall, and execution declareth them not to haue dyed properly for treason, but for Religion. For in their enditements they were charged with mainteining opinions tending to the subuersion of the Catholike faith, and destruction of the Prelacy of the Church. Furthermore Sir Iohn Oldcaſtle albeit outlawed vpon this enditement, yet was not executed as a traytor, which he should haue bẽne, if he had bẽne indede guilty of this treason, but iudged againe as guilty of matters of hereſie. Lastly they were burned, and not hanged drawne and quartered, which sheweth, that they were reputed heretikes rather then traytors.

Finally the reporters of this pretended rebellion do much vary among themselues, and from the publike records. Parsons ridiculously affirmeth, that Sir Roger Acton was condemned of high treason by Act of Parliament. But the records of Parliaments afford no such Act, and refute this high leasing.

Fabian sayth, that Sir Roger Acton, Beuerley and Browne were conuicted of hereſie and treason, and for the same hanged and brent.

Stow

Stow by the malice of his suggesters being abused mentioneth treason only, and writeth, that 37. were hanged on the 13. of Ianuary, and Sir Roger Acton on the tenth of Februarie. Others vary in numbers and place. The enditement mentioneth but twenty thousand, and yet saith more then is true. Walsingham increaseth the number to fifty thousand.

Neither is it materiall, albeit Polydore, Hall, Holinshead, and others do write, that Sir Roger Acton, and his fellowes were executed for treason. For by a Statute it was made treason to maintaine the doctrine taught by Master Wicleffe, and most do follow Thomas Walsingham, a lying Monke, and one that sought all occasions to speake euill of Wicleffe, and other professors of the truth. And yet doth he not say as Parsons boldly affirmeth, that Sir Roger Acton was a dissolute fellow, and perhaps of no Religion at all.

In the third place Parsons inueigheth against Master Iohn Browne, Master Beuerley, and Richard Silbeck, that were vnder pretence of treason put to death in Saint Giles his field for the profession of the true faith, the which albeit denyed by him, yet appeareth to be most true by the arguments before alledged.

Whereas therefore Robert Parsons playing the person and part of a sycophant, sayth, that Master Foxe is prest by Copus, and bringeth only a coniecturall discourse to excuse these men of treason: he seemeth either not to haue read the edition of the Acts and Monuments *anno* 1583. or else to lye wittingly and willingly against his owne conscience and knowledge. For there Master Foxe, by matter of record, story, and sound argument, refuteth all Copus his coniectures, and malitious slanders. To which he may make answere at leisure, if he meane to maintaine his sycophanticall discourse. In the meane while he cannot be thought to be very wise, that chargeth innocent men with suppotals of treason and conspiracy,

himselfe being detected to haue had part in all the conspiracies and treasons that haue bene of late time plotted, as is at large declared in the answere to his witlesse Warn-word, and in diuers discourses also of the Secular Priests. Neither haue Papists reason to talke of treason against Princes, themselues hauing lately plotted a most execrable treason, rebellion and massacre, and being notoriously conuicted of it.

William Sawtree was one of the first, if not the very first, that we reade to haue bene martyred in England for matter of mere Religion maintained against the Popes faction. For before that time the Romish Prelates of the Romish Church had no Statute, nor colour of Lawe authorizing them to burne any man for matter of mere Religion, nor afterward, if the originall rolles had bene well loked into. But saith Parsons, he was conuented before the Archbishop of Canterbury for hauing preached certaine new fantasticall doctrines. He addeth also, that we may see in Foxe foure or fiue particular fooliſh Articles, which afterward he recanted one by one the 22. of February, *anno* 1400. Thirdly he telleth vs, that the poore mad fellow would willingly haue recanted againe, and that he was burnt notwithstanding, although he denyed not the reall presence. Finally he affirmeth, that he scarcely held one point of Religion fully of those which are in controuersie betwixt the Papists and vs. But first it is no maruell, though wicked atheists do scorne them, and esteeme them mad, that giue their liues for the truth. For as it is in the 5. of Wisdome, the wicked thinke the liues of the godly madnesse, and vsually do scorne them. Secondly that doctrine which Sawtree taught against the idolatrous worship of the crosse, and the popish conceit of transubstantiation, is neither new, nor fantasticall, but the ancient and sober doctrine of the Apostles and ancient Fathers. Thirdly, Master Foxe doth not report only foure or fiue, but eight, or more Articles, and all repugnant to the new fantasticall doctrine of the moderne Church of Rome. Which if they seeme foliſh, it was the fault of the Popish Prelates that framed

framed them, and not of him that answered them. Fourthly it is false, that he recanted these Articles the 22. of February *anno* 1400. or that Master Foxe sayth so. For he sheweth out of the records of Norwich, that he recanted certaine Articles the first of May *anno* 1399. and that he was condemned by the Archbishop of Canterbury *February* 22. *anno* 1400. All which for want of good spectacles is foully mistaken by this dull-pated Parsons. Fiftly, as he did not directly denye the reall presence imagined by the Papists, so most true it is, that he did not grant it. Sixthly it cannot be collected out of any record, that Sautree would haue recanted the second time. But if he had offered so to do, what cruell men were they, that refused to receiue the penitent to mercy? And how farre do they differ from the Nouatian heretikes, that refuse to reconcile the repentant demanding mercy? Finally this holy Martyr agreed with vs against the Papists in denying transubstantiation, the popish worship of the Crosse and of Angels, vowes to goe on Pilgrimage, the pattring of canonicall houres or oraisons, and such like points. True it is therefore, that he is a holy Martyr, and died for confessing the truth, and that the popish Prelates that burned him were cruell persecuters, and enemyes of the truth. Neither is it materiall, that this holy man is sayd in the Register, to haue answered indirectly. For it is the manner of this generation to report the words of their Prelates and themselues with all aduantage, and by all meanes to disgrace holy men, that repugne against their impieties and heresies.

William Swinderby preached the truth against our aduersaries in diuers points sincerely, before he was conuented before the Bishop of Lincolne. Afterward being drawne to reuoke some of his opinions through the crafty perswasion of some Friers, yet presently after he returned to himselfe againe, and stood manfully to the truth, for the which he was condemned by the Bishop of Hereford, and so cast into prison, where by all likelyhood he died. The Papists would no doubt haue burned him, but that during the reigne of

king Richard the second, they had power only to arrest such men, and not to put them to death, so that as yet Antichrist had not his full power in England. Against this holy Martyr notwithstanding Parsons obiecteth first, that it was vncertaine whether he was put to death or not. Secondly that he was an Anabaptist, being accused to hold, that no man ought to impriſon another for debt: that no Prelate can curse any man, except he be knowne before to be curſed of God: that all priests may absolue alike: that euery Priest taking an annuall pension committeth simony: that a Priest consecrating in mortall sinne committeth idolatry, and certaine other fantasticall things. Lastly he saith, he was accused of certaine other mad tricks. But first if it were sufficient to accuse only, then neither the Apostles themselues, nor the ancient Prophets can be innocent. Secondly where Parsons setteth downe the obiection, and not the parties answere, he playeth false, and runneth into that same fault, which in his relation concerning the conference in France he taxeth so sharply in others. Thirdly it is no point of Anabaptistry to hold, that all Priests haue the keyes of the Church committed to them, and absolue with like power, or to talke of simony, or the abuse of the keyes of the Church committed by Popish Prelates. Fourthly if Parsons account this a mad trick, to admonish the people to beware of lecherous Priests, that often abuse the wife or maydes of the house: then hath he some reason to frame this accusation against Master Swinderby. But if both then and now, false & lecherous Masse-priests commit very foule abuses in this behalfe; then was not he mad, that gaue this friendly admonition, but those rather, which contrary to his counsaile admit such lecherous shallons into their houses. Finally albeit Master Foxe seeme to be vncertaine, whether this holy man were put to death or not, yet certaine he is, that either he was secretly murdered, or else kept in prison vntil he died. For then ẏ law permitted heretikes, as they were called, to be kept in safe custody; and the records of Hereford testifie, that he was condemned as an heretike. Swinderby therefore being perse-

cuted,

cuted, and dying in prison, being committed thither for professing the truth, was a true Christian Martyr, and the popish prelates that sought his life true Antichristian wolues. Further, Papists, that in their Articles charge Christians with false and heinous crimes, and hold them for confessed, are hereby conuinced to be sycophants, and false inglers. Thirdly it appeareth by the sentence of the Bishop of Hereford, that Swinderby was condemned for an heretike, and yet not done to death. Whereby it is euidently proued, ỹ the synagogue of Antichrist before the yeare 1389. when that sentẽce passed, had no power to cut Christian mens throtes, that were repugnant to their Antichristian doctrine, by the lawes of England. It is not therefore the Church of Christ, but the synagogue of Antichrist, that of late hath begun to murther Gods Saints, and to dye her garments red with their blood.

Against Iohn Ashton Parsons hath no more to say, but that presently vpon the condemnation of 23. Articles of Wicleffe by a Conuocation holden in Oxford, he with two companions being examined vpon their oaths &c. recalled the same publikely. But he chargeth Master Foxe with defacing all, or the most part of the publike Ecclesiasticall records. But first the blind bátilheaded fellow mistaketh the place of the Conuocation, which he might haue séne plainely expressed in the record. For the Conuocation mentioned by him was holden not at Oxford, but at London, in the house of the Dominicans, or preaching friers. Nert this mæting was no publike Conuocation of the Clergy of the Church of England, but only of certaine Prelats, Doctors and Friers conspiring against the truth, as the Scribes and Pharises did against Christ. Thirdly, these 23. Articles being not formally found in Master Wicleffs bookes, and varying from those articles which were gathered and condemned by the false conuenticle of Constance, do bewray the fraud and falshood of our aduersaries, that not only condemn men vnheard, and also impute vnto them things most vntrue and slanderous. They do also

impudently falsifie recoꝛds, as may be pꝛoued by the suppoſed anſweres of Maiſter Aſhton and his fellowes. Foꝛ although this article, *Quod Deus debeat obedire diabolo*, is not found among the 23. articles, to which they gaue their anſwers, and was deuiſed afterward in the wicked conuenticle of Conſtance, yet is the ſame, and their anſwer vnto it thꝛuſt into the recoꝛd. It is therefoꝛe pꝛobably to be ſuſpected, that theſe anſweres, together with the pꝛotestation ſuppoſed to be made by them, were rather foꝛged in their names, oꝛ offered to them to be ſigned, then truly & actually made by them. The which alſo may be confirmed by the teſtimony of M. Bale *Centur.* 4. who ſaith, that Aſhton Wicleffs ſcholler did firmely perſeuere to the end. But be it, that foꝛ feare oꝛ hope he wauered, yet in the end he recouered himſelfe, and continued afterward conſtant in the truth, & was therefoꝛe committed to pꝛiſon, from whence he neuer eſcaped. M. Bale ſaith he died there, although the cruelty of his aduerſaries giue pꝛobable ſuſpition that he was ſecretly murthered in pꝛiſon, as diuers others were, to ſaue coſts in their kæping.

As foꝛ M. Foxe, all that knew him will witneſſe his reſpectiue, ſincere & vpꝛight dealing, and ſuch as ſuſpect without cauſe, may be reſolued by the ſame recoꝛds yet extant in the regiſters of euery Biſhop mentioned by M. Foxe, and reſerued foꝛ a perpetuall conuiction of the fraudes, impiety, & woluiſh cruelty of ẏ Romiſh clergy. His plaine manner alſo of pꝛocæding in ſetting downe the grounds & oꝛiginals of matters of queſtion mentioned in his ſtoꝛy, may fræ him from all ſuſpition of coꝛruption. In the meane while the coꝛruptions and falſhood of our aduerſaries appeare plainly in this pꝛocæding againſt Wicleffe and his followers, and may be conuinced by infinit particulars. Parſons his vnlneſſe appeareth notoꝛiouſly in miſtaking matters ſet beꝛoꝛe him. The cruelty of maſſing Pꝛelates is teſtified by the recoꝛds of Aſhtons pꝛoceſſe. Foꝛ hauing no law publikely to put him to death, yet they kept him in perpetuall pꝛiſon, if they did not pꝛiuily deſtroy him.

Rayling

Rayling against D. Castellane, Parsons saith, he was an apostate Frier, and running out of his Monastery at Tourney in Flanders, and ioyning himselfe with a sister went into France, & preached Lutheran heresie in diuers townes. In his double Calendar he saith, he preached seditious doctrine at Mets in Lorreine, and was condemned by the Bishop of the said City and burned. And thus you see what light account this apostate from Religion, and fugitiue Frier maketh of the death of Christes Martyrs. But his hast was such, that he forgot to bring proofe of his assertions, which by diuers arguments may be conuinced of falshood. For first there is not the least suspition in all the story, as if Castellane had either woman or wife with him, whē he went into France. Secondly it was truth, and not heresie, or doctrine tending to sedition, which he preached. Thirdly he was not condemned by the Bishop of Mets, but by Theodore Chaumont his Vicar Generall, after he had bene degraded by the titular bishop of Nicopolis. Fourthly he is no Apostate, that forsaketh the lousy religion of Friers, as Castellane did, but he that forsaketh true Christian Religion, and taketh on him the habit of a Frier, as Parsons hath done. God giue him grace to see it. Finally, Tourney is not in Flanders, but in Artois, of which this vagrant companion ought not to be ignorant, but that hast and malice made him blind. No reason therefore hath this mastife to barke against this holy Martyr, if he will speake truth, nor cause to speake against M. Foxe, for that Castellane was no Englishman, considering that he doth not bound his story within the limits of the Church of England.

Master Thomas Whittell a worthy Minister of Christes Gospell cōming before Bonner that butcherly Prelate, was first sore beaten by him on the face with his fists, then euill lodged & euill intreated for his diet, and at the last martyred for the truth of Christ Iesus. What then hath this barking Frier to say against this holy man, why we should not repute him a true Martyr? First he saith, he was a rinegate maried Priest. But these termes do rather beseeme a rinegate Sodomitical apostata, then disgrace this Martyr: who, if he

chose the state of wedlock, being not able to liue single, he entred into an honorable state of life. If he forsoke ỳ priesthood of Baal and idolatrous worship of Saints, he declared himselfe a true Christian. But this sodomiticall frier forsaking both his country & true Religion, which he once professed, and adhering to forreine enemyes, and gun-powder traytors, doth deserue the reward of an apostata and a traytor. Further he blusheth not to say, that the diuell perswaded him to reuoke his recantation, whereas Harpsfeild his witnesse and warrant, hath no such words. Only he saith, that the same Whittell told him, that Satan had bene with him in the night, and told him that he was damned.

But what reason hath any man to beléeue this lying companion being an vtter enemy and persecuter of true Christians, where he vttreth matter sounding to their disgrace? Only this we may beléeue, that Bonners sister was this lechours mistresse. For he affirmeth it in expresse terms in a certain letter to Bonner. Iesus, saith he, euermore preserue your good Lordship, and my mistresse your Lordships sister. As for M. Whittell the truth is, ỳ his recantation being extorted frō him, so much grieued him, that he could neuer find quiet, vntill he had defaced it. God it were for Parsons, if being warned by such examples, he could repent himselfe of his foule apostacy, and his rayling against Gods seruants. To speake for Bonner against M. Whittell, certes, he had small occasion, séeing in the one, as the records testifie, nothing but impatience, violence, rayling, scorning, and in M. Whittell, nothing but méekenes, patience and constancy in suffering. Beware therefore ô England, how thou doest euer receiue into thy bosome such wicked, violent, & bloody cut-throtes, and secure thy selfe against the gun-powder Papists, that of late haue endeuoured to blow vp this state.

M. Bartlet Greene was a yong man of rare vertue, and forwardnesse, and therefore beloued of all those that had occasion to know him, and only hated of the popish sect for the profession of the truth, for which he was cruelly done to death by the blod-sucker Bonner. But saith Parsons, the said Greene told Feckenam, and confessed the same afterward publikely

likely in the Bishops Cõsistory, that Pet. Martyr at his first comming to Oxford acknowledged himselfe vnto him, that he was in many points a Papist. But what is this against M. Greenes Martyrdome? Furthermore, the Record doth conuince Parsons herein of lying. For thereby it appeareth, that not M. Greene, as this lying lozell telleth, but Fecknam told, that Peter Martyr at his first coming to Oxford was a Papist. A matter very improbable. For why should he leaue Italy, and his liuing there, if he were so indeed? M. Bartlet did vtterly deny it, affirming onely, that Peter Martyr said often, that being a Papist he had not read S. Chrysostome vpon the 1. Cor. 10. nor other places of the Doctors. But after he had read them and considered them, that he was content to yeld to them. And why to yeld, vnlesse they had plainely made against the Papists? He alledgeth further, That M. Greene made a league with M. Goodman a pernitious fellow after his comming to the Innes of Court, and that he held correspondence with him being at Geneua. But by his storie it appeareth, that his acquaintance began with M. Goodman in Oxford, and that he wrote a letter vnto him in answer of another receiued from him touching certaine rumors of the Queenes death. As for M. Goodmans opinion touching womens gouernment, it concerned M. Greene nothing. But if he be a pernitious fellow, that wrote against womens gouernement; then is Parsons himselfe a most pernitious fellow, who holpe to write, print, and publish Alans libell against the late Quenes gouernment, exhorting her subiects and others to lay hands vpon her, and bending all the force of his wit for many yeares together to worke her trouble. He hath also in his traiterous booke of titles spoken against the gouernment both of men and women, giuing not onely to the Pope, but also to their seditious subiects power to depose them. Finally, he endeuoureth to lay a charge vpon M. Greene, as if he had bene priuie to the conspiracie of William Thomas against Queene Mary. But that matter is not once obiected in all the processe made against him, nor should haue bene forgotten, if any such thing had bene. Secretarie Bourne

Bourne also in his letters to Bonner sheweth, that the cause of his commitment was matter of Religion, and not treason, albeit the words of his letter made some question to be asked of him concerning the Queene. As for the case of William Thomas God knoweth, what it was, and will reueale the truth at the last day. That he should be charged with treason vniustly, it is likely: for thereby the Prelates brought many innocents into hatred, and some to destruction. But that he should attempt to kill the Queene, there is no probabilitie, he gaining nothing by any such enterprise, but running into most manifest danger. Stow I confesse witnesseth somewhat against him, but he is very partiall in Queene Maries matters, and in nothing of any authoritie being a simple and vnlearned Botcher, and abused by craftie suggesters. To conclude therefore this point, we see in M. Greene an example of rare pietie and vertue, of humilitie, patience, and constancie, and in our aduersarie, examples of lying, killing and slandering the Saints of God.

Against Iohn Tudson, Thomas Went, and Thomas Brown, that most chearefully suffered death for the confession of the true faith in the bloudie time of Queene Mary, Robert Parsons hath nothing to except, But that the first was an apprentice, and so obstinate and arrogant, that the Bishop of London was forced to burne him. That the second was a sheareman of Essex, and obstinate in diuers hereticall opinions, especially about the Sacrament of the altar. That the third was a poore labourer, and burned for sowing and defending Caluinian opinions. But these exceptions, as they are calumnious, so are they vaine and friuolous. For first, it is neither obstinacie nor arrogancie to defend the true faith of Christ against the damnable hereticall opinions of the Romish synagogue. Secondly, so farre were Browne and Tudson from obstinacie, that they offered to submit themselues, if Bonner could conuince them of any heresie. Thirdly, that which Parsons calleth the Sacrament of the altar, is not the Eucharist instituted by Christ, but a meere Idoll. Fourthly, it was no disgrace for ancient Martyrs to be either souldiers, husbandmen,

men, or tradesmen and men of meane condition. Why then should the meane estate of these holy Martyrs be any preiudice vnto them? Finally, herein the crueltie of the Romish Pharisees appeareth, that regard neither great nor small, noble nor base, but burne all, that seeme contrarie to their faction. Neither is it materiall, that Bonner and others vsed faire words vnto them. For who can trust their words, that saith their deedes? They vsed sugred promises to draw them from their Religion, we confesse: and so we reade, that the diuell made large promises to Christ, if he would fall downe and worship him. Their pittie was like to Crocodiles tears, that weepeth before he deuoureth such, as he hath in his power. All Bonners promises notwithstanding Thomas Brown called him a bloudsucker: and so indeed he proued. For he sucked all their bloods, and would haue spared none, if there had bene three hundred of them more.

Of Iohn Philpot of Tenterden, Parsons saith not much. Only he obiecteth that He was a poore ignorant countriman, and that he was burned at Canterburie for obstinacie in heresies. And reuelleth at M. Foxe, For that by him he is made a rubricate Martyr. But first he must vnderstand, that it is the true faith, and sincere doctrine concerning the worship of God, which by this foule-mouthed Heretike is termed heresie. Secondly, as Parsons doth here, so the Pharisees in time past said of Christians, that they were base and vnlearned people. Thirdly, he is not to be reputed ignorant, that so wel vnderstood the abhominations of the Masse, and the falshood of Popish Religion. Finally, the ordering of the Calendar was referred to the ouersee of the print. If then there be any differences in circumstances betwixt the same, and the body of the booke, or any distinction in colours more then is decent, the same is not to be imputed in any sort to M. Foxe. But if it be so hainous a matter to write the names of Martyrs in red letters, what termes will serue to expresse the infamous crueltie of the Romish Inquisitors and executioners, whose mouths are red with sucking the bloud of Christs lambs, & whose garments are died red in their bloud?

Isabell

Isabell Foster (saith Parsons) being infected with Caluinian opinions stood obstinatly to the same. Likewise he sheweth, how Ioane Lashford misliked the Masse, and the doctrine of the sea of Rome. Therefore he calleth the first a silly woman, and reproueth the second as resoluing her self without ground or reason. But neither is it strange, that God chuseth silly women, and foolish things to confound the wisedome of the wise, nor was the faith which Isabell Foster professed, any opinion or deuise of Caluin, or other man. As for Ioane Lashford, why might not God aswell touch her heart, to beleeue truth deliuered out of Scripture, as it pleased him to touch the heart of Lydia to attend the words of Paule, as we reade Act. 16? In the meane while litle doth his discourse make for the honor of his bloud-sucking Prelates, that without remorse or pitty bring both silly women, and young maidens to their death. D. Storie also shewed himselfe in this procesle inhumane, who prosecuted this Ioane Lashford to the death, albeit she had bene somtime his seruant, and was, as some thinke, of his kindred. Most bloudie also do the Papists declare themselues to be, who first murthered her father in law Iohn Warne, and after him her mother, and then this poore maiden, that came to attend her mother in the prison. But saith Parsons, making himselfe sport in the shedding of an innocent maidens bloud, Ioane Lashford was a maried maid. He addeth further, That she was maried to Iohn Warne an vpholster. But there is nothing worthie of laughter in the report of this storie, vnlesse it be Parsons his grosse ignorance, ouersight, and blindnesse, who, as it seemeth, could not reade or vnderstand the procesle of this maiden laid before him. For there it appeareth, that this Iohn Warne was husband to Elizabeth Warne mother to Ioane Lashford by a former husband called Robert Lashford, and that Ioane Lashford was sometimes called Warne of her father in law, and not of any husband. And thus we see how shame followeth scorne, and how scorne floweth out of ignorance, and that blockish ignorance is the buckler of these stupide persecutors of Christians, ỹ will see no truth making against thẽ.

After

After these men and women thus by the massing Pharises murthered, there follow fiue other in the Calendar, which were martyred at Canterburie, to wit Iohn Lomas, Anne Albright, Ioane Calmer, Agnes Snoth, and Ioane Sole, who for denying the Popish auricular confession, and the idole of the altar were without all pittie condemned to the fire, and accordingly executed, Anne Albright crying out against the wicked Masse-priests, that examined her, as against the subuerters of Christs truth, and children of perdition.

Against these fiue Robert Parsons taketh diuers exceptions, saying first, That Lomas was a very young man, and a simple artificer, and went vp and downe with his English Bible, and would beleeue no more, then was contained in the word of God. But if we list to loke among auncient Martyrs, we shall find many both younger, and more simple and ignorant in matters of Religion, then he. Furthermore to beleeue no more to be necessarie to saluation, then that which is contained in the word of God, is the office and propertie of euery good Christian. The Apostle 2. Tim. 3. doth shew, that the Scriptures are able to make the man of God perfect. And Basil *Moral. reg.* 80 saith, It is the property of a faithfull man, with a full assurance to beleeue all that is conteined in Scriptures, and neither to refuse any thing (in them) nor to adde any new thing vnto them. As for the fable of Lomas his going vp and downe with the English Bible, it is a matter merely deuised by Rob. Parsons to make himselfe sport with laughing at the holy Bible. And yet I hope our Martyromastix will not deny, but that Christians had better cary about with them the Bible, then Popish Legends, or counterfeit Decretals.

Against Agnes Snoth he obiecteth, That she was a poore widow. But if God refuse not the offering of the poore widowes mite; then we may assure our selues, that he did not refuse this poore widowes offering, that gaue her selfe a sacrifice and an oblation for the iustification of that true Religion, which she professed, against the errors of Poperie.

Against

Against Anne Albright and Ioane Sole he alledgeth, that the first was a poore mans wife, and that the second was a spinster. As if poore women, and spinsters fearing God, were not farre to be preferred before impious and Sodomiticall Monkes, and Friers, and wanton Nunnes. This Rob. Parsons may assure himselfe, how poore soeuer and simple he taketh these women to haue bene, that the meanest of them was not so poore and simple, as the Blacksmiths wife his mother, nor she so honest, nor religious as they.

He is also much offended, that the Popish priests were called Pharisees and subuerters of Religion: and yet in hypocrisie they equall Scribes and Pharisees, and in crueltie farre surpasse them.

In the end of his inuectiue against these holy Martyrs he runneth vpon M. Foxe, and calleth him simple fellow, saying: That it had bene as easie a matter to make them to deny twenty, as two articles. He addeth also, That auricular confession, and the reall presence be auncient points of beleefe. Finally, he imagineth, That if these women had bene seuerally asked, what points they held, their folly and lacke of faith wold haue appeared. But in the meane while his lacke of honesty, and not onely of Christian charitie appeareth, who without all ground of reason stirreth vp such a smoke out of the smother of his owne fantasticall surmises. For as well may he say this of auncient Martyrs. Secondly, if it be simplicitie to relate truth, and conning to speake vntruth; then is it more reputation for M. Foxe to be called simple of such a leud companion, then for Parsons to be discouered and taken for a conning contriuer of mischiefe, and a mischieuous traitor and impostor. Thirdly, there is no question, but that diuers simple women in the Church of England are able to make a better confession of their faith, then diuers politikes esteemed prudent in Spaine and Italy, but altogether brought vp in blindnesse and ignorance. Lastly, it is a most ridiculous assertion, to affirme, that the Popish doctrine of auricular confession, and the carnall Popish reall presence consisteth of points of auncient beleefe, when any man may perceiue,

reine, that the doctrine of the reall presence was first established by the authoritie of Pope Nicholas *c. Ego Berengarius. dist. 2. de Consecrat.* And that auricular confession was not enforced vpon Christians before Innocentius the third his time, who gaue credit to it by the Chapter *Omnis vtriusq; sexus. De Pœnit. & remiss.*

The bottome of his poisoned stomacke he degorgeth against William Waterer, Stephen Kempe, William Hay, William Lowicke, William Prowting, Nicholas Finall, Matthew Bradbridge, Iohn Philpot, and Thomas Stephens. In his larger examen he forgot Thomas Hudson a Martyr nothing inferior to the rest, and no where mentioneth fiue others, that being condemned for the profession of the Christian faith against the abhominations of Antichrist died of hunger in the Castle of Canterburie before the time of their execution. Fiftæne there were in all, whereof ten were burned, and fiue famished. This is the mercie of the whorish synagogue of Rome, and of our powder-men. Some she burneth, others she famisheth, others she causeth to be massacred, none she spareth, but such as she cannot kill, and the powder-men would blow vs vp all, if they could. Nay, as she taketh away the liues of godly Martyrs, so she destroyeth the soules of as many, as she can abuse by her entisements, depriuing them of holy Scriptures and their soules food, and giuing them poyson in stead of meate & nourishment, and powdermen sought lately to blow vp the King and his lignage, and the whole Parliament house.

Against these which he nameth, Parsons obiecteth first, that they were all rude, poore, and ignorant people, but extremely mad in the maintenance each one of his particular opinions. So also the Gentiles thought of diuers of the first Christians, that died for the testimonie of Christ Iesus. The Apostle Paule also was deemed mad, when he spoke the words of truth and sobrietie. Happy were Parsons, howsoeuer he esteemeth himselfe wise, if he could exchange his estate with those, which he deemeth to haue bene extremely mad. Secondly, he saith, Their Articles were fiue or seuen,

whereof

whereof the fourth was, that they denyed the reall presence, the fift, that they affirmed, that no man with a safe conscience could receiue any Sacrament of the Church in a strange tongue. But if the man had bene well in his wits; then would he haue charged them with their answers, and not with the articles ministred vnto them by their persecutors. If he mean that they answered so, as he alledgeth, then must he proue it by good testimonie. For the author whom he followeth, hath no such matter. Finally, he obiecteth, That there was some discord amongst them in smaller matters. And this he imagineth to be, That one was a Lutheran, another a Zuinglian, another a Caluinist, another sauoring of Anabaptisme, Wicklifianisme, Hussisme, and Puritanisme. But these are termes of his ruffianisme and rayling humor, of which he bringeth not any litle suspition, or shew of proofe. Beside that, full well he knoweth, that Anabaptisme is generally condemned of vs as heresie, and that there are no such diuisions among vs, as are pretended. Himselfe, if his face be not hardened, cannot deny, but that we agree much better in England, then the factions of Friers and Monkes, of Scotists and Thomists, secular Priests, and Iebusites, Bellarminians, and Suarists, Parsonians, and Watsonists, and the seuerall rabbles of such rakehels.

So to conclude the defence of Martyrs for this moneth, we may clearely see the vanitie of our aduersaries calumniations, the crueltie of bloudie Papists, the rage of Antichrist against the professors of the truth, and the patience of Christians, that so long haue endured the malitious Pharisees to insult ouer their brethren.

CHAP. II.

A Defence of Sir Iohn Oldcastle, M. Onley, M. Luther, M. Rogers, *and other Martyrs and Confessors, referred to the Moneth of Februarie.*

IT is no wonder, if Rob. Parsons by all meanes seeketh to defame the memorie of the noble Lord Cobham, otherwise

wise called Sir Iohn Oldcastle, whom his predecessors the cruell and wicked brode of Cayne did most iniuriously persecute and cruelly murther. For neither can base fellowes brooke nobility, nor Caynes posterity, such as resemble Abel, nor Monks, Friers and Massemongers the true professors of the Gospell. Yet herein we reioyce, that malice hath so blinded our aduersaries, that their reproches do redound to the glory of the godly, and their accusations and slanders minister vnto vs matter of iust defence.

First he saith, that the Lord Cobham was a most disorderly seditious and troublesome man. Secondly, that he was infected with diuers heresies in doctrine. And the first he proueth, for that he was condemned of treason, as he saith, and open rebellion, as well by particular arraignement, as also by act of Parliament. The second he thinketh is cleare, for that he was condemned by orderly iudgement of the Church in those dayes, as he calleth it. But howsoeuer the proceedings and acts made against him, and in his disgrace seeme to charge him with treason; yet the only cause of his condemnation was Religion, which was by an act of Parliament at Leycester *ann.*2. *Henr.* 5. made treason. For there the followers of the doctrine of Wicleffe are charged with insurrections and treasons against the King. Thomas Walden also in *Prolog. Tomi* 1. *ad Martinum Papam*, doth plainely testifie so much. *Nec mora longa processit*, saith he, *quin statutum publicum per omne regni concilium in publico manauit edicto, quòd omnes Wiclenistæ, sicut Dei proditores essent, sic etiam proditores Regis haberentur.* Plainely he telleth vs, that all Wicleuists were by acte of Parliament declared to be traytors to the King. Likewise Roger Wall *de gest. Hen.* 5 *statuit & decreuit* saith he, *vt quotquot illius secta, qua dicitur Lollardorum, inuenirentur emuli & fautores, eo facto rei proditorij criminis in maiestatem regiã haberentur.* Polydore Virgil doth likewise concurre with them *lib.* 22. *hist. Angl.* & sheweth, that all the followers of Wicleffes doctrine were deemed *hostes patriæ*, that is, enemies of their country. And this was all ỳ reason, why this good Lord was executed as a traytor, & no other act, enterprise or deseigne.

how to colour, and to make shew to the people, that indeed he died for actuall treason, like cunning sallaries the Prelatiers have foisted in an inditement, As if he had conspired the death of the King and his brethren, of which in all the procedings against him, there is not the least suspition. The role of the inditement is without any Iurors. Beside that it beareth date the same day, that the conspiracie was supposed to be made. Thirdly, the Kings brethren are misnamed. Lastly, it conteineth matter most improbable. For neither doth it appeare, that the Lord Cobham was in Saint Giles his field, or had any intelligence with them, that were there executed, or had either cause to rebell, or meanes to execute any designe against the King or his brethren. Fabian saith, he fled out of the Tower into Wales, and lived there foure yeares. How then could he be with the supposed Rebels neare London, when he is testified to haue bene in Wales? Againe, if this people was assembled without a head, as is said in his inditement, how could he be head of them? As for the testimonie of Walsingham a professed enemie of the followers of Wicleffe, and a lying Monke reporting matters by hearesay, he deserueth no credit. Stow hath the most part of his lyes concerning the Lord Cobham out of Walsingham, which notwithstanding he vnderstood not being Latine, and he a mere English Taylor. The tale he telleth of setting vp King Richard is absurdly forged. For he was dead before. So then it appeareth, that he was cleare of rebellion, and treason, and was onely condemned of treason, for the loue he bore to the doctrine of truth, and Christian Religion.

That he was a disorderly fellow for life, his very aduersaries could not say of him. Nay there appeareth no such matter obiected against him in all the processe and records, that concerne his busines.

Finally, that except, wherein he was not so well informed concerning some points of Poperie, he was not to be touched with any error concerning matters of faith. The imputation of Anabaptisme laid vpon him by Parsons, and

Stowes

Stowes prompters, is but a lewd collection framed out of their owne malice. So is also that report, that is deuised by some of his enemies, to wit, that he should say, that he would rise againe the third day.

We therefore conclude, that the noble Lord Cobham died as a Martyr of Christ Iesus, and was neither dissolute person, nor rebell, nor traitor, nor heretike, but a Christian and true Lord. Of his faith he was examined. For cõfessing the truth he was condemned, and burned. But his spirit liueth, and in the day of iudgement he shall stand as a witnes to conuince his aduersaries, not onely of crueltie, but also of falshood and calumniation. Then also it will appeare, that he was not condemned by the Church, but by the synagogue of Satan, and not by orderly iudgement, but by tumult, false information, and conspiracie against the truth of Christ Iesus.

Against Iohn Claydon and Richard Turmin, Parsons obiecteth, That they were of the number of Conspirators in Saint Giles his field. But of this there is not the least suspition. Nay here both Stow and Walsingham faile him. Walsingham and Fabian testifie, that Claydon was burnt for matter of Religion, and the like testimonie doth Fabian giue of Turmin. Wherefore hauing litle to say against them for matters of Religion, he telleth a Walsingham tale out of Walsingham, How Claydon presumed to giue orders to his sonne. And how a certaine Maltman hoping to be made Knight, rode with guilt spurres in his bosome. He quarrelleth also with M Foxe, for that the time of Claydons suffering noted in the Calendar agreeth not with M. Foxes booke, and for that Richard Turmin, that in the Calendar is set downe for a Martyr, is not so called. But the tale of Claydons giuing orders to his sonne is improbable. He loued not the Masse so well, that he would any way procure his son to be made a Masseprieſt. The fable of the Maltman is a ridiculous fiction of some Masse-monging Priest, with whome Malt seemeth to haue bin aboue Wheat. The differences betwen the booke and the Calendar are not great. But whatsoeuer

they are, they are not to be imputed to M. Foxe, who gaue the ordering thereof to the Grauers, Printers, and Correctors. The reason why he did not set downe Turmin for a Martyr was, for that he found no record for his passion, and perchase beleeued not Walsingham, nor Fabian in that matter. So scrupulous was he to write any thing without good ground, and so vnlike to his aduersaries, that write they care not what, so it may tend to their aduersaries disgrace, though void of all truth and colour.

So it appeareth, that our aduersaries obiections against Claydon and Turmin are friuolous. But he shall not so easily cleare those wolnish Pharisees, that prosecuted Claydon to the death, and burnt him without law, seeing the supposed Statute *De haretico comburendo*, was onely the Kings act, without the consent of the commons. They also either burnt Turmin, as before is said, and that contrarie to law, or else kept him in prison vntill he died, or was priuily made away, according to the stile of powder-men. Such Jaylors are Popish prelates. Leud Jaylors, and leuder executioners.

Richard Houeden a Woolwinder, and Thomas Bagley sometimes a Priest, gaue their liues for the profession of the true faith. And yet this false Frier, and professed enemie of the faith saith litle either against them, or in defence of the bloudsuckers, that take away their liues. Onely he telleth a tale out of Stow of one Richard Russell a Woolman, and William Maundeuill bayliffe of Abington. But what (I beseech you) maketh this against the Acts of Houeden and Bagley, which he pretendeth to impugne? Doth he suppose, that the fault of one Woolman doth bind all Woolwinders? Or that these two are to answer the faults of men vnknowne? Beside that, Iohn Stow is but a poore swaine to come so often vpon the stage to speake in causes of Religion, especially sauoring of Poperie, like an old Mustard pot of mustie Mustard, and set on by craftie and malitious Papists readie to auouch any vntruth, to the disgrace of Religion, vpon his simple credit. Parsons his exclamation therefore after

after the rehearsall of the story of Russell and Mandeuill, that said He would make Priests heads as cheape, as sheepes heads, is nothing but a sudden pang of his owne grosse folerie. For neither were Mandeuill and Russell professors of Wicleffes doctrine, nor doth Stow know so much, though otherwise a bold aduenturer vpon other mens reports, nor are the fruites of the doctrine, which Wicleffe taught, other then such, as might well beseeme Christians.

Hauing therefore no speciall matter to obiect against Houeden and Bagley, he chargeth them with generall articles calumniously put vpon Christians of those times. But neither did they hold that doctrine, that is conteined in the Articles, nor doth Parsons truly report them. For in those Articles they are not charged to teach, That no man is bound to pay Tithes by Gods law in the new Testament, as this shameless fellow reporteth, but that it is sinne to giue any thing to begging Friers. He omitteth also this Article, That the confession of sinnes to the Priest is vnneedfull. Furthermore, if Parsons meane to charge a partie, he must not obiect the Articles, but either the parties answers, or good proues. But he like a prudent fellow, and loth to trouble himselfe too much, bringeth neither, foolishly supposing the Articles to be good proues.

Against William Thorpe conuented before Arundel, Archbishop of Canterburie, *Anno Domini* 1407. Parsons obiecteth first, that he recanted. But in the proceedings against him there is not the least surmise of any such matter. Neither is it necessarie, That he should either recant, or burne, as he collecteth. For it may be very well, that he was famished in prison, or secretly murthered, as many others were, or else escaped by helpe of good friends. Secondly, he chargeth him with denying to sweare by a booke, and for holding, that Tithes are not due in the new Testament, and for beleeuing the Popish reall presence. But this last is false. For he declareth, that bread remaineth in the Sacrament after consecration, which cannot stand with the Popish reall presence, that supposeth Transubstantiation. The second is also ca-

luminously imputed to him. The third in a good sence may well be defended. But did not Master Thorpe see all the abuses of popery, yet, if he died for truth cõfessed in most points, he deserueth to be reputed a Martyr.

Speaking of that noble and valiant Captaine Zizca, who long maintained the cause of the oppressed against the persecution of the bloudy Papists and powder-men of Bohemia, he could not refraine his tongue from rayling, but calleth him the famous Bohemian theefe, rebell, murtherer, and manqueller. But if he deserue these termes, which defended the hungry, poore, and distressed Christians from the hands of fat Monks, treacherous Friers, and perfidious tyrants, what termes may be thought sufficient to expresse the tyranny and cruelty of popish inquisitors, & massacrers, and of English powder-men, which murther old and yong, man and woman, rebell against Princes, and excite the subiects to offer violence to their dread Soueraignes? Againe what may be said of Captaine Cowbuck, *aliàs* Parsons, that did his vttermost endeuour to bring the Spanyards into England *anno* 1588. and *anno* 1597. to murther the Queene, and all her faithfull subiects? Beside that by all meanes he hath attempted to stirre vp rebellion in England, and to bring his countreymen vnder the yoke of strangers. Lastly what may be said of the powder-men and vndermining Papists, which the fift of November last practised to blow vp the King, his children, and the whole Parliament? Matters which Zizca neuer did, nor thought. May he defended his poore countreymen against the inuasion of strangers.

Furthermore, he was neither theefe, nor rebell, nor murtherer, but maintained innocent Christians against theeues, cut-throtes, and murtherers, that contrary to the Emperours safe conduct had murthered Iohn Husse at Constance, and would haue practised the like in Bohemia vpon his fauorers, but that they would not suffer themselues by such wicked fellowes to be butchered. As for the

the testimonie of Dubrauius, and Aeneas Syluius, that speake against him, it is not much to be regarded, considering they speake as parties, and out of their passion. That Zizca should affright Wenceslaus the King, or offer violence to the Maior of Prage, or any other, but such as came with armes against him, it cannot be proued by any sufficient witnesses. The like may be sayd of that report, which commonly goeth of him, that he should commaund a drummes head to be couered with his skinne. The thing is inhumane, and as men of that trade say, not faisible. Parsons to adde vnto the calumniations of others, doth insinuate, that Zizca had some intelligence with the Lord Cobham in England. But if he bring not forth his author, he shall not be able to deny, that himselfe hath forged this slander. For he is to yong to know of himselfe what matters passed in those dayes. Finally, he endeuoreth to make a difference betwixt the confession of Zizca, and that of the Lord Cobham: but the particulars he keepeth to himselfe. In matter of substance there was no difference at all. Wherefore vnlesse he can alledge better matter, and bring more sound proofes; the name and memory of this valiant man shall liue, when the infamous Captaine Cowbuck shall be buried in perpetuall obliuion.

Paule Crawes a Bohemian dyed not for any seditious doctrine, nor was he euer a souldier or scholler of Zizca, albeit Parsons a souldier and scholler of Satan, and a notorious seditious Iebusite affirme both. He was cruelly burnt by the Bishop of Saint Andrewes in Scotland for defence of the true faith against the errors of the synagogue of Rome, and namely in the doctrine of the Sacrament of the Altar, Images, and Auricular confession. Let him therefore rest in the number of Christes true Martyrs, and his enemy Parsons let him be calendred in the catalogue of rinegued apostataes, and disloyall and seditious traytors.

Thomas Rhedon a Carmelitan Frier was cruelly tormented, and at the last burned at Rome for preaching against the abhominations of that place and people, and the Popes excommunications, and therefore rightly named a Martyr, as dying for giuing testimony against that spirituall Sodome, and sinke of sinne, and heresie. But saith this Martyromastix, he scarce held one article with vs, but many with the Papists. As if Papists did dislike either the abuses of Rome, or the Popes vniust censures. Further if he held no doctrine against the church of Rome, why was he done to death? Againe if he were popish, what reason haue some to say, that he defended Priests mariages?

Reynold Peycocke sometime Bishop of Saint Asaph in the dayes of King Henry the sixth is said to haue recanted certaine opiniõs against the church of Rome. But neither was his doctrine truly set downe in articles, nor semeth the recantation extant in his name to be his. For if he had recanted, why should he still haue bene deteined in prison, where it is probably to be suspected, that he was secretly made away. For that is the common practise of this generation.

Thomas Gascoin in his Theologicall Dictionary, Part. 3. saith, he preached at Paules crosse, that no man is bound to beleeue the determination of the Pope, and that the Sacraments of the Church were then euill handled, and diuers such like points against the common doctrine of the church of Rome. Well then may Rob. Parsons barke against this mans memory, but he shall neuer be able to teare, or bite out the name of this good man and true teacher out of the roll of Confessors. For albeit in articles it was obiected, that he denied three articles of the Creede, yet no man is to beléeue his sclanderous accusers. By the words of Gascoin it appeareth rather, that he denyed the common interpretations of Scholemen, that beléeue the church of Rome to be the sole Catholike Church, and communion of Saints, and teach that Christ harrowed hell, and not the articles of the Créede themselues, that concerne the Catholike Church, and communion of Saints.

Against

Against Roger Onley **Priest, the Lady** Elenor Cobham **Dutchesse of** Glocester, **and the mother of the Lady** Yong, **this polthorne priest and sonne of no Lady, nor honest woman, but rather of** godwife **Cowbuck, maketh a great** stirre, finding, as is said, that the said Roger was condemned, and executed for working the Kings death by Negromancy; **and that the** Lady Elenor **was condemned for attempting the same by Witchery; and supposing the mother of the Lady** Yong **to be** Margery Iourdemaine **the famous Witch of** Eay. **And thereupon he concludeth,** that Negromancers, and Witches are by M. Foxe put into the Calendar of Martyrs, **and of this supposed victory he maketh great triumph. But all his foleries and collections vpon these foolish and weake surmises are long since refuted by** M. Foxe **himselfe in his edition of Acts and Monuments** *an.*1583. *pag.*702. and 703. being before obiected by Harpsfield **that blind harper vnder the maske of** Copus. **The summe whereof is this, that howsoeuer Negromancy and Treason was obiected to** Roger Onley, **and Witchery to the Dutchesse, yet it was the fauoring of true Religion against the Pasle-priests and Friers, that brought the first to his end, the second to trouble. And that may partly be collected out of the history of** Iohn Harding, **where speaking of the cause of** Onleys **death, these words are found,** Against the Church and King cursedly, by help of one Roger Onley. Polychronicon **testifieth, that he and his copartners were accused for working Sorcery and Enchantments** against the Church and King. **Furthermore** Master Bale *Cent.*8. *c.*4. **mentioneth a booke of this** Onleys **entitled,** *Contra vulgi superstitiones:* **whereby it appeareth, what conceit he had of the church of** Rome of those times. **That both the Dutchesse and he were innocent in the matters, wherof they were accused, it may appeare first, for that** Roger Onley, **as** Fabian **testifieth, tooke it vpon his death, that he was guiltlesse. Furthermore the prosecutor of this matter was the Cardinall of** Winchester, **a great enemy of those that followed the doctrine of** Wicklesse, **who, as it is likely, would not haue followed this matter so eagerly,**

if

if it had bin matter of mere treason, and not Religion, that moued him. Thirdly there is no probability, if any such treason had bene intended, that they would haue communicated the same to so many, as were called in question about that matter. But that they should méete about matters of Religion and conferre about them, it is very probable. Finally if in déede they had bene guilty of treason, neither is it likely that Iohn Humme a party in this businesse should haue bene pardoned, or that the Lady should escape by doing pennance with a Taper in her hand, and being confined to the Ile of Man, as Fabian testifieth. As for the Witch Margery Iourdemayn she was neither named, nor thought vpon by Master Foxe, nor could she be the mother of the Lady Yong, or be meant or vnderstood by her. For whereas the Witch Margery was burned in the yeare 1441. or thereabout, the mother of the Lady Yong is sayd to be executed 1490. that is almost fifty yeares after. Gladly would Parsons wipe away these answeres. But when he hath wiped all shame from his face, and all truth from his fingers, both will they stand, and the shame and malice of Papists appeare, that impose crimes of treason, negromancy, witchery, and such hainous imputations, vpon such, as they hate for Religion, their Popes and themselues being most guilty of these crimes, and the other most innocent.

He quarrelleth also with Master Foxe, for that he set not downe the name of the mother of the Lady Yong, whom he supposeth to be called Ioan Boughton, and for that there is some difference in names and times betwixt Master Foxes booke, and the Calendar. But the answere is very easy. For he had no reason certainely so to name her, seeing he had no other certeintie of the name, but by coniecture. As for the differences supposed they are not great. But whatsoeuer they are, they are not to be imputed to Master Foxe, but to him that dressed the Calendar, that in all points loked not exactly to Master Foxes booke. Little reason therefore had Parsons for this cause to rayle vpon

vpon Master Foxe, and lesse against that reuerend Father Bishop Iewell, that in this quarrell is not his partie, and neuer refused to amend any error, that could be shewed him. But Papists call truth error, and error truth, and respect nothing, but their owne wills and humors.

The order of the Calendar doth now bring vs vnto Master Luther, a constant and valiant professor and confessor of Christes truth, and a principall instrument vsed by God for the reuelation of the abhominations of Antichrist. And therefore no maruell it is, although the brood of Antichrist maligne him, raple at him, and deuise what they can against him. Parsons cannot speake of him without passion. But seldome are passion and rage coupled together with reason and pietie.

He telleth vs of his parentage, and education. But what maketh this to the purpose? I hope Parsons cannot much bragge of his owne either parentage or education, and lesse of his eduction, or departing, or expulsion out of Bailioll Colledge. He addeth diuers points also concerning Luthers manners and doctrine, and whatsoeuer could be deuised to his disgrace. But his principall author to proue all, is one Cochleus, a slaue of the Pope, hired to raple vpon him, and a witnesse not worth a cockle shell. The rest of his grounds are words wrested out of his writings contrary to their meaning, and certaine speaches spoken out of passion by his aduersaries.

Neither did he forget to tell of Luthers familiaritie with the Diuell, as he calleth it, affirming, that the Diuell disputed with him against the Masse. But this cannot be proued out of his words *de Missa angulari*, so often obiected by Papists. He sheweth only, how Satan tempted him to despaire, for that he had bene a Masse-monger, which Luther knew to be naught without the Diuels prompting. But if we looke on the other side into the liues of Monks, Friers, and Romish Saints, we shall finde indeede, that nothing could be more familiar, then the

Diuell

Diuell and they. Christopher in the legend is said to haue serued the Diuell: Oswald wrastled with him: Dunstan toke him by the nose. Ignatius and Xanier had him much in their company. May by his testimony they proue diuers poynts of their erroneous Religion. In the legend of Christopher they declare, that he feared the signe of the crosse. By his testimony in the second Nicene Councell they proue the worship of Images. By the same the Franciscans proue the glory of their patron in heauen. Neither could the Masse-priests proue the reall presence without the Diuels helpe, as is proued in the detection of the impostures of popish priests in casting out of Diuels.

Seeing therefore, that Luther, notwithstanding the malice and rage of Satan, of the Pope, of his Cardinals, of the Pilate-like Prelates, of the mutinous Masse-priests, of the rayling Monks and Friers, and all the Popes complices, stood firme in the profession of the truth, why should he not be remembred as a holy Confessor? May seeing his life was so holy, and his doctrine so sound, that all his aduersaries are not able to spot him, notwithstanding all their malice and curious examination of the same, what reason haue the Papists to honor a packe of filthy Monks and Friers Canonized by the Pope, and not to honor Luther, whose life and doctrine declare him to haue bene a most excellent and holy man?

Likewise Thomas Norris, Thomas Eckles, Thomas Bungay, Pope of Eay, Peake, and George Carpenter, deserue a place among the number of Christes holy Martyrs, and so much the rather, for that as they suffered death for the profession of the sincere faith against the Pope, so they suffer in their fame the sting of the serpentine tongue of Parsons the Popes Cerberus, and barking parasite. And yet he can say nothing against them, but that they were artificers, and diuers of them burned for certaine Wicleffian opinions, as he calleth them. As if artificers could not glorifie God by their Martyrdomes, or as if begging, lazy and lousy Friers were to be preferred before honest men, that

that get their liuing by their labour. As for the points of faith, for which they suffered, they are no opinions of Wicleffe, but the doctrine of the Apostles and Prophets.

He rayleth at them also, and calleth them ignorant. But ignorance among lay Papists is estæmed better then knowledge. And such is estæmed no good Christian among vs, that cannot yæld reason of matters belonging to his salnation. Further, these men, whatsoeuer Parsons accounteth of them, were not so rude or ignorant, but they could well discerne betwæne the true worship of God, & the idolatrous seruice of the Romish Church; betwixt the Lords Supper, and the idoll of the Masse; betwixt Religion and Superstition. Let Parsons therefore, and his consorts beware, that such artificers as these are do not one day rise vp against them in iudgement, and testifie against their impieties, barbarous cruelty, and manifold abhominations. Their patience and sufferings giue witnesse to the truth. Their blod crieth for vengeance against their mercilesse persecutors.

The last of this moneths Martyrs are fiue most excellent men, to wit, two reuerend Bishops, Father Hooper, and Father Farrar; and three most learned Preathers, Master Rogers, Master Sanders, and Doctor Taylor: and two most resolute women, to wit, Agnes Potten, and Ioan Trunchfeld, all murthered by the butcherly Masse-mongers, and like to pure gold refined through the fire, and honored with the crowne of Martyrdome. What reason then hath this black-mouthed curre to barke against their memories? Forsooth not much, but that malice and hatred of truth maketh him to breake forth into hatefull and scandalous reproches. First he sayth, that all these fiue miserable men beeing Priests, were drawne into heresie first and principally by concupiscence of the flesh, and the sensuall bait of getting themselues women vnder the name of wiues. But neither can any Christian man account them miserable, that dyed for the

the name and faith of Christ; nor would this apostate call true faith heresie, but that he himselfe is a professed heretike. The which, although otherwise it be very apparent, yet it appeareth in this also, that he accounteth honest mariage to be no better then the concupiscence of the flesh, and sensuality, and saith nothing against the filthy and execrable lives of Masse-priests and other votaries, who wallow in all sensuality, and in vnnaturall lust exceede the men of Sodome.

Secondly he telleth, how Master Hooper was infected with Lutheranisme, as he termeth it, in King Henry the 8. his dayes, and that being forced to leaue Sir Thomas Arundels seruice, he went beyond the seas, and by Bullinger, and his owne wife was made a Zwinglian. Afterward he taketh pleasure to relate, how he was reuiled by that butcherly and vnciuill beast Bonner. But his termes of Lutheranisme and Zwinglianisme are but flowers of his owne folery, there being not so much dissention betwixt Luther & Zwinglius, as betweene Thomas Aquinas and Scotus, Caietane and Catharine, Bellarmine and other popish agents, the Iebusites and Secular Priests. As for Master Hooper, he had his Religion neither from the one, nor the other, but from the Apostles and Prophets. And Bonner reuiling him shewed himselfe to be of the number of those, that persecute and reuile Gods children, & a biting wolfe rather then one of Christes sheepe.

Thirdly he insinuateth, that he forsoke the Duke of Somerset, and turned to the Earle of Warwike, and so was made Bishop of Gloucester. Neither doth he forget to relate the contention betwixt him and other Bishops concerning apparell, and other ceremonies. But neither was this difference bitter, nor did it long continue. Furthermore the same was not about matters of faith, but of ceremonies, such as haue often risen in the Church betwixt learned men, and bene caried without breach of charity. And as for his Bishoprick, he did not as popish prelates vse to do, attaine it either by ambitious sute, or simoniacall compact, but by his owne merits respected fauorably by the King. That he forsoke the Duke of Somerset, is a matter merely forged. For he

he vied himselfe alwayes dutifully towards him, and was beloued of him againe. If he meddled not with the contentions betwixt the Earle of Warwike, and the Duke, he deserued great commendation for his modesty, and ciuill cariage.

Fourthly, Parsons chargeth him with refusing the oath of the Kings supremacy. But he is not able to iustifie this slander with any shew of proofe. Nay it is most apparent, that he alwayes stood for the Kings supremacy against the Pope, and neuer refused any obligation of oath, or other thing required to that end. True it is, that he refused to submit himselfe to certaine rites and ceremonies vsed in consecration of Bishops, for which Archbishop Cranmer, and Bishop Ridley refused to consecrate him, fearing, lest if they should so do, they should incurre the penalty of ỳ law of *Præmunire*, and for that the King dispenced with them, as his letter yet extant testifieth. But what is this to the refusall of the oath of supremacy, the refusall whereof in some cases is treason.

Fiftly he saith, that by his Patron the Earle of Warwike he got another Bishoprick much bigger then the former. But the history of his acts sheweth, that all this fauour proceded from the Kings good opinion conceiued of him, and that these two Bishoprikes were vnited in one, and the reuenues so charitably dispensed by this Bishop, that he would neuer haue proued rich man, although he had enioyed thẽ longer.

Finally he saith, he was involued not a little in the rebellious action of his old patron the Earle of Warwike. But therein he obserueth his old manner of lying and slandering: and farre palleth Bonner himselfe, who albeit an vtter enemy to Bishop Hooper, yet neuer laid any such matter to his charge.

Let vs then set this godly Bishop against Bonner his greatest aduersary: and so the qualities of the one, and the other will soonest appeare. By their actions we find, that Bonner was a fierce and sauage wolfe, Hooper a meeke and gentle lambe. Ye a filthy lechour, this an honest maried man. Ye a murtherer, Hooper a pastour, a father of Christes sheepe. Ye a brutish cholerike beast, as appeared by his outragious

ragious answeres at the time of his examination, Hooper a man indued with great patience. He a butcherly murtherer and persecutor, Hooper a most godly and constant Martyr. The termes therefore of Libertine, Heretike, and false Bishop, which Parsons bestoweth vpon him, do rather fit Bonner, then him; and Parsons doth rather resemble Celsus and Porphyrius, then any god Christian. For as they scorned Religion, and despised holy Martyrs that suffered for the same, so doth Parsons, shewing himselfe their true follower. Yet no way doth he same so wise as they. For they boasted not of their consorts cruelty, nor complained, that their sentences were not in record. But this fellow boasteth in his owne iniquity, and blusheth not to complaine, that Gardiners sentence against Bishop Hooper is not recorded, which most notoriously would haue declared his great violence and cruelty, and exemplified the lewd humors of other Papists.

Against Master Rogers Parsons obiecteth first, his wife and children; next his concurrence with Tyndal in the translation of the Bible; thirdly the articles obiected vnto him; fourthly his opinion concerning matter of ceremonies; lastly his conformity to the humors of others, and such like friuolous toyes. But for the first, these bougrely companions shew themselues to want shame, that condemne lawfull mariage in Priests, when they see their vnmaried Votaries to liue in fornication and all beastlinesse.

Parsons only hath some reason to speake against children lawfully begotten, himselfe being a notorious bastard, and a lawlesse companion. The like pretence hath the Pope, and his consorts, that haue so many bastards. For the second we say, that the Papists would not condemne the translation of Scriptures into vulgar tongues, but that their workes are euill, and may not stand in the light of Gods word. For the third it is apparent, that Stephen Gardiner in his sentence of condemnation pronounced against Master Rogers, doth most falsely report his words. For neither did Master Rogers confesse, that the church of Rome

is

is the catholike Church, nor deny, that Christs naturall body and blood is in the sacrament, if we vnderstand it sacramentally and spiritually. For the fourth we say, that diuersity of opinions about ceremonies, especially where matters are not yet setled, doth not diuide mens loue, or make a difference in matters of faith. Finally, M. Rogers followed Luther no further, than Luther taught the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles. Nothing therefore hath Parsons to say, if he will say truly, that doth any way sound to the disgrace of this holy Martyr. But the barbarous cruelty of the Butcherly Masse-priests, that intreated him hardly in prison, and denied him the sight of his wife and children, which the law of Nature obligeth to him in duty, and at the last shed his innocent blood without forme or authority of law, and without grounds of proofe, deserueth to be remembred of all posterity, and of all Christians to be abhorred.

M. Sanders also was cruelly vsed in prison, rudely reuiled in iudgement, wrongfully condemned for teaching the truth, which neither the Pope, nor all the fiends of hell shalbe able to disproue, and at the length for the same rather smothered, than burned to death. What then, thinke you, hath Parsons to degorge against this holy Martyr? Forsoth nothing, but his affection to his wife and his yong sonne: and that for meere spight only, as it seemeth, which he beareth to marriage, and to children lawfully begotten, himselfe being a loose fellow, and a base-begotten swad, as he is charged in the writings betwixt him and the Secular Priests, and a great Patron of the Sodomiticall single life of Masse-priests, Monks, and Friers. One thing also he might haue remembred, that was tolde Stephen Gardiner by Sanders, to wit, that in his booke De vera obedientia he made Queene Mary a bastard. Another thing I must tell him, that S. Peter was a married man, and had a daughter, as is sayd in the legend, called Petronell, which was so faire, that one Flaccus became enamoured of her: which happening not long before his death, she must nedes be borne and begotten during his Apostleship.

Against D. Taylor he raileth, as if he had beene a sensuall fellow. He sayth also, that he maintained the carnall reall presence in the Sacrament. But for the first, it is a simple argument of sensuality, that a Christian should forsake all he hath, and giue his life for the testimony of the trueth. For the second we answer, that we may safely affirme as Doct. Taylor sayd, viz. that we eat Christs body, when we receiue the Sacrament worthily, which is all which he sayd; and yet notwithstanding we deny the Popish carnall real presence of Christs body in the Sacrament. He addeth further, that D. Tailor holpe to burne M. Lambart. But that is an office more fit for Martyr-burning papists, than for him. All that he did, in M. Lambarts cause, if he did so much, was to argue with him. Fourthly, he misreporteth D. Taylors arguments in prayse of Priests marriages. For where he alledged these places, It is not good for man to be alone; and Encrease and multiply; to proue that it is no sinne to mary; Parsons turneth them to another end, as if he had concluded thereof, that every man must haue his woman: which was not his intention. For if that had beene all his desire, he might still haue continued Masse-priest, seeing Masse-priests want not their women, albeit they haue no wiues. Finally he giueth out, That the shiriffe perswaded him to acknowledge his errours: whereof there is not any memoriall to be found in his story. But on the other side we find, how Gardiner bishop of Winchester called him Knaue, Traitor, Heretike, arrogant knaue, and foole, and other villanous and reprochfull termes. Gardiner also being charged with the breach of his oath to King Henry the eight, had no other defence to make, but that it was Herods oath. We reade further, that D. Taylor affirmed, that the idolatrous Masse was full of venome, and that going to execution he was forbidden to speake, and buffeted on the face, and had a fagot throwen at his head, as he stood at the stake. So likewise was the reuerend Bishop Hooper railed at and rudely handled at his execution. All which Parsons forgot to tell. But the Records do speake, and testifie, that in pride these Butcherly Prelates passe the Pharisees

sees, and in scorning religion, the Pagans; and in rigorous cruelty, the Turks.

The reuerend Father Rob. Farrar Bishop of S. David in Wales, after many verations and wrongs, was in the end condemned by a leud fellow there intruded as Bishop, and a notorious falsifier of Records. For whereas Bishop Farrar refused to grant the naturall presence of Christ in the Sacrament, that falsary in his pretensed sentence maketh him to defend, that in the sacrament of the altar the substance of the bread and wine remaineth with the body & blood of Christ. And for this cause Parsons calleth him Lutheran. But his only ground is the falshood of that vngling fellow. He chargeth him also with his mariage. but that is a matter, that often hath beene answered. Here only it is to be noted, that where in the processe it appeareth, that the Masse-priests of Wales openly kept Concubines, that the same is not once mentioned or reproued by Parsons: only he disliketh lawfull mariage. Finally he sheweth, how he was charged with 56. articles. But good dealing required, that he should haue also related his answers, whereby most honestly he dischargeth himselfe, and sheweth, that this was a conspiracy of his enemies against him, and of wicked fellowes, who had robbed the church, kept concubines, falsified Records, and committed many other grosse abuses. Thus we see he concealeth all that may make for Christs holy Martyrs, and collecteth euery toy sounding to their disgrace. He sayth nothing also of his despightfull vsage both before and at the time of his execution, nor doth he tell vs, how one Richard Granell, when he stood in the fire, dashed him on the head with a staffe, and murdred him. But God seeth and remembreth all their doings, and at his good pleasure will reuenge them.

Agnes Potten and Ioan Trunchfeld of Ipswich were there crowned with martyrdome for denying Christ to be in the sacrament, as he was borne of the virgin Mary, and for detesting the Romish Antichrist, with all his superstitious, and rotten religion. But sayth Parsons, It is not like, that they vnderstood well these matters, and could distinguish, how Christ

might be in heauen, and how in the sacrament. He sayth also, that if these women had been examined asunder vpon diuers points of religion, they would not haue beene like, and conformable the one to the other. Lastly, according to his wonted maner, he raileth at M. Fox, and telleth vs, that it is hard to iudge, whether he were more mad or foolish, than the two women. And why so, trow you? Forsoth, because he sayth, that with comfortable words of Scripture they required the people to lay holde vpon the Word of God, and not vpon mans deuices. But whatsoeuer his malice maketh him to vtter against M. Fox, it is no hard matter to discouer his folly and madnesse in standing vpon such friuolous points. For first it is no hard matter, to vnderstand the doctrine of the Sacrament, if we respect nothing, but that which is deliuered in Scriptures, and profitable for vs to know. As for schoole quiddities, and distinctions, as they are superfluous foleries, so they are not very well resolued of the Papists themselues. May when Parsons shalbe forced to shew, how Christes body may be both in heauen, and on euery altar at one time, and yet not in the spaces betwéne, he shall finde himselfe puzled. Secondly, that these women were well instructed in necessary points of Faith, there is no question. And as for the points of religion now disputed by the scholemen, neither the holy Martyrs of olde time, nor the ancient Doctours of the church did either vnderstand them, or euer heare of them. Finally, the Scriptures are not so difficult, but that Christian women may receiue comfort out of them, and serue also to admonish others. And this may not only be performed, but also affirmed without note of folly or madnesse. But to preferre legends and decretales of Popes before Scriptures, is folly; and to striue against trueth, méere madnesse. Mad therefore are the Popish prelates, that do this, and keepe Christians from knowledge, and shew lesse mercie to them, than the Turks and infidels.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

A Defence of the most reuerend Father and holy Martyr Archbishop Cranmer, M. Bilney, *and other holy men, who in the Calender before* M. Foxes *booke are referred to the moneth of* March.

BEing after some trauell come to the moneth of March, Rob. Parsons runneth on wildly like a March hare, and raileth vpon the saints of God, like a wilde scolde, or rather like a furious frier enchanted with the sorcery of the purple whore spoken of Apocalyps. 17. The first he taketh in hand is M. Thomas Bilney, who for preaching against the idolatry and other abuses of the Romish church, was cruelly burnt at Norwich. Thomas More sayth, he recanted the second time, bare his death patiently, and saued his soule. So it appeareth, that the Pope and his complices, are both bloody and inexorable, not sparing such as are the second time penitent. This is their practise, and this is their law against heretiks, as they call them, relapsed, as appeareth c. ad abolendam. de hæreticis. But contrary to Scriptures, Fathers, lawes of Emperours, decrées of the ancient church of Rome, and all practise of Catholikes. Our Sauiour Christ Matt. 18. taught Peter, that he was to forgiue his brother, not only seuen times, but also seuenty times seuen times. The ancient Fathers condemned the Nouatians, as heretikes, for not admitting into the Church sinners repentant. August. lib. 3. contr. Parmen. c. 6. sheweth, that heretikes were punished for their correction. *Si quando in flagello vt se corrigant admonentur*, sayth he. The Emperour Cod. de sum. trinit. l. inter claras, sayth, he will not deny pardon to offenders desiring the same. The like also is prouided Cod. eod. l. Manichæos. The ancient church of Rome did neuer vse to cut Christian mens throats, but rather to instruct them in the faith. Nay later canons do clearely condemne this wolnish rigor against relapsed penitents. c. adhuc instant. de pœnit. dist. 3. and c.

agnouimus. 26. q. 6. The glosse also in cap. ad abolendam. seemeth to be of opinion, that relapsers being penitent, are only to be punished by losse of goods. All which serueth now to no purpose: for these bloody Butchers execute Christians relapsed, though neuer so penitent. and Rob. Parsons spareth not Bilney, though a saued soule, as Sir Thomas More testifieth. Nay, which is worse, they both murder them, and slander them when they are dead, as may appeare in the case of Bilney, who both by More and Parsons is accused most falsly to haue recanted the second time; which M. Fox disproueth by the attestation, not only of the reuerend Archbishop Parker present at his burning, but also by diuers witnesses, whose words are recorded in the acts of Bilneys martyrdome. It is proued also, for that no recantation could euer yet be shewed signed with his hand. And as for the attestation of Sir Thomas More, it deserueth no credit, the man being partiall in this cause, and not daring to name his witnesses, nor alledging any sufficient proofe. For admit M. Bilney should not condemne the Masse and auricular confession, yet if he preached against the Popish worship of saints and images; then is he for vs against the papists. Parsons therefore to disgrace M. Bilneys martyrdome, sayth, that M. Bilney held, that the soules of our Lady and of Peter and Paul are not in heauen, and that it is no spot of heresie to beleeue, that our Lady was not alwayes a virgin. But this is a common practise of our aduersaries, to deuise slanderous matters against true Martyrs. If these points had not beene foisted into Bilneys answers by sallaries, no question, but his aduersaries would more haue vrged them. He addeth further, that M. Bilney condemned Luthers assertions, & held more with the Romish church, then with vs. But the first is nothing to purpose, seeing it appeareth not, that M. Bilney euer knew what those assertions were. Beside that, it is cleere by M. Luthers answers, that diuers points ascribed to him were nothing but slanderous collections of his aduersaries. The second is not proued. But be it, that he did not know all the abominations of the Romish Babylon, yet seeing he

died

died for preaching against the popish worship of Saints and Images, against their superstitious pilgrimages, and Monkish opinions concerning vowes, and habits: it is meer wickednesse, to race his name out of the catalogue of Christs holy Martyrs.

The second man, against whom hee raileth, is William Taylor, burned in the beginning of the reigne of king Henry the sixth; a Prince the more vnhappy, as not redressing, nor loking to represse or stay the murder of Gods Saints. Against him he obiecteth, that he differed onely from the Romish church in the article of praying to Saints. But if that were so, why did the Friers, that followed him, obiect foure articles against him, which are yet extant in record? Furthermore albeit he should only hold that point soundly, yet should he for that only deserue to be recorded, as a witnesse of the truth against Papists. And if hee did not hold that against them, then are they murderers and cruell persecuters, that take pleasure in the shedding of innocent mens blood for nothing. Neither hath Parsons reason for this cause to raile on the Church of God, as beggarly. For when many abuses are once entered into the Church; not onely hee that teacheth aright in all, but hee that teacheth truth in any one article, is to be admitted for a witnesse of the truth.

The third man is Iohn de Wesalia, who both preached and wrote against diuers points of Popish doctrine. But Parsons omitteth the first article, wherein it is said, that hee taught, that we are saued freely, and through meere grace by Christ: and the last concerning the Popes supremacy, and diuers others. Further hee altereth, and choppeth those, which he mentioneth at his pleasure. He saith also, that he recanted his opinions. But this recantation was nothing else, but a submission to the catholicke church, whose iudgement maketh nothing against his doctrine, if by the church we vnderstand, as we ought to doe, the catholicke church, containing the Apostles, Prophets, and primitiue church of Christians. Afterward he affirmeth, that the man denied and abiured publickely his opinions, and that M. Foxe con-

fesseth so much of this man. But herein he vttereth three vntruths with one breath. For neither doth it appeare, that he denied his opinions, nor that he abiured them, nor doth M. Foxe confesse any such matter. Only he sheweth that he submitted himselfe to the church, or rather, that he gaue ouer to contend against the Romish clergy. Finally hee telleth, how M. Foxe leaueth out the article, wherein he was charged to deny the holy ghost to proceed from the sonne, as well as the father. But either he lieth desperately, or else he saw not M. Foxes edition of the yeare 1583. where Io. de Wesalia standeth charged with this article also p. 725. and 726. albeit we may perceiue, that he was vniustly charged therewith, not confessing any such matter. And that may appeare also by Parsons his owne words, where out of M. Foxe he goeth about to charge him with that heresie, and quarrelleth also with M. Foxe, because he termeth it an opinion only, and calleth it old. As if heresies were not opinions held with obstinacy, and as if that error imputed to the Greekes were not elder, than many points of Popery.

The fourth man is Weselus Groningensis, for his great learning called lux mundi, and therefore vniustly calumniated by this pild Frier, that is fex mundi, that is, the scumme of the world. He spoke against indulgences, purgatory, Masses for the dead, the supremacy of the Pope, and diuers other points, which Parsons thought best to conceale. Only he telleth vs, that he taught, that the sentence of excommunication proceeding from a true, godly, honest, simple, and learned priuat man is of more force, than from the Pope, or other Prelat. But like a fallary he addeth this word priuate, and these words, other Prelate: whereas the mans true meaning was to prefer the censure of inferiour honest Prelates, before the Popes censure. Beside that, euery Christian hath power for his owne particular to abstaine from the society of wicked men, that are incorrigible. He saith also, that he taught, that when the Pope or Prelates gouerne not well, the inferiors, be they neuer so base, ought to resist. But he leaueth out his last word, viz. him, that sheweth, that he

he spoke against the Pope: and changeth his words, as if he spoke against others beside the Pope and his Prelates, whereas his purpose was onely to declare the Popes tyranny to be unlawfull. He affirmeth further, that this article was borrowed from Wickleffe, who held that magistrates in mortall sinne were no magistrates. But neither did Wickleffe so hold, nor is there the like reason of an usurping lawlesse Pope, and of lawfull Magistrates. But Papists to draw him into hatred turned that which was spoken against idle Prelates, to the Magistrate; and that he spoke conditionally they make him speake absolutely. Beside that, suppose Weselus should speake against such, as command unlawfull things, doth not the holy ghost teach us, that it is better to obey God than man? finally, Parsons excepteth against these two, as strangers. But he should haue considered, that M. Foxe doth not onely tie himselfe to relate things done in the Church of England, but purposeth to comprehend whatsoeuer he thought worthy of memory in the whole Church.

The fifth man is Henry Sutphen, a learned man, & a zealous preacher of syncere doctrine, who was therfore without all forme of law set vpon by diuers Masse-priests, Friers & others, and by them spoiled, bound, beaten, wounded, and afterward haled, halfe hanged, halfe burned, halfe massacred, and in the end cruelly killed at Diethmaran. 1524.

The sixth is Iohn Huglein, the 7. Peter Flisteden, the 8. Clarebach, the 9. is M. Patricke Hamelton, all men of learning, and burned to ashes for defence of the truth against the errors of popery. Of all which Parsons hath little to say, but that speaking of them he addeth words of scorne and contempt to M. Foxes relation. Henry Sutphen he scarse toucheth for feare of discouering the barbarous cruelty of his owne consorts. Of Huglein he concludeth, that in most points he held the Popes doctrine, because M. Fox saith, he held not with the bishop of Romes doctrine in all points. But a man may as well conclude, that Parsons in most of his writings forgeth and lieth, because in all points he draweth neither plainly nor truly. Speaking of Flisteden and Clare-

bach

bach he complaineth, that Foxe hath not set downe their particular propositions. But either his eies were not his own, or else his eies, penne and tongue agrée not. For M. Foxe expressly saith, they were put to death for dissenting from the doctrine of the Papists concerning the Lords Supper, and Popish traditions and ceremonies. Reporting M. Patricke Hamiltons articles, like a fallary he leaueth out some, and addeth others, for which hée was not condemned. That the Pope is Antichrist, and that it is not necessarie for a bishop to obtaine the Popes bulles, and that auricular confession is not necessarie to saluation: he leaueth out, making only mention of them in generall termes. That the holy Patriarches were in heauen before Christs passion, and some others, hée addeth, altering and chopping of matters, so as they might best seeme to make for his purpose. By the acts of the Archbishop of S. Andrewes it appeareth, that the articles agrée not with the sentence. Most falsely also he saith, that K. Iames the fifth caused M. Hamelton to be apprehended, conuinced, and adiudged; whereas by histories it appeareth, that anno 1525. when M. Hamelton was tried, the king was a child, and no way guilty of the bloud of this innocent. Proceeding yet further he telleth vs, that hee was infected with many nouelties of doctrine, not yet brought into knowen distinct classes of Lutherans, Anabaptists, Zuinglians, Oecolampadians, Carolstadians. But if you except the Anabaptists, whose errors we renounce, the other distinct classes are nothing, but meere railing termes deuised by Staphilus, Cochleus, Stapleton and such like lying and railing companions. for concerning matters of faith they agrée better, than the Thomists and Scotists; Dominicans and Franciscans; secular Priests and friers; Iebusites and other cananitish sects of Monkes. as for M. Hamelones doctrine, it was as much more ancient, than Popery, as Christian religion went before Antichristian idolatry and superstition. Finally Parsons surmiseth, that M. Hamelton held the real presence. but that is his owne verball slander without ground. Thus you see these godly Martyrs easily cleared from this vngodly Iebusites

sites vniust imputations. But who can cleare the persecuting inquisitors from the staine of shedding their innocent blood? who can iustifie their shamelesse lies and slanders? who can deny, that Frier Cambell one of M. Hamletons accusers and persecuters being summoned by him a little before his execution, to answer his vniust dealing before God, died shortly after most miserably?

The tenth man of this month is Thomas Hitton, the 11. David Foster, the 12. Edward Freese, the 13. Valentine Freese, the 14. place is due to Valentines wife, the 15. to father Bat, of which number Edward Freese and Bat were confessours, the rest holy Martyrs cruelly persecuted, and murdered for professing the faith, and not yelding to the heresies of the Romanists. Let vs therefore see, what the Diuell hath vttered by the mouth of Parsons against their memories. Against Thomas Hitton he saith, he was a fond and wilfull heretycke. But good it had beene for Warrham and Fisher, that caused him to be burned, if they had offended no more than he in wilfulnesse and heresie, especially seeing they wilfully maintained the heresies of Popery, and wickedly oppressed true and harmelesse Christians. As for the imputation of fondnesse, it proceedeth rather from his malicious enemies, that fondly set downe his words and misreport them, then from him. Against David Foster he saith, he was a poore wilfull artificer, and burned for foolish hereticall opinions. But Lazarus was poore, and yet more in fauour with God, then the rich glutton, and many of the ancient Martyrs were poore, and exercised manuall trades. Furthermore the ignorant Pagans thought the preaching of the Gospell foolishnesse, and deemed Christians wilfull, that died for the profession thereof. But in this foolishnesse & wilfulnesse is more wisedome and fortitude, than in Parsons, and his Paganicall consorts. The like obiection he maketh against Valentine Freese and his wife, burned at Yorke an. 1531. and therefore he must content himselfe with the like answer. Against Edward Freese he obiecteth, that being a Monke and a painter he painted a certaine ryme vpon a wall, and being called to

answer

answer behaued himselfe like a wild man. But he forgot to tell, that he was apprehended for painting certaine texts of Scripture, and that he was bound so hard with iron chains, that they entred into his flesh, and how hee was kept three daies and three nights without meat, and lastly that this amazement proceeded of famishment. Against Bat he saith, he was an obstinate old fellow, and took vpon him to spread Luthers doctrine. But if he durst to haue set downe the particulars; the same would haue appeared to be the doctrine of the Apostles, & not any deuise of Luther. in the meane while it appeareth, that the bloody complices of the purple whore would not that Christians should meddle with scriptures or true doctrine, and that they famish and murder all such, as repugne or spurne against their heresies.

The 16. place is assigned to the reuerend father Arch-bishop Cranmer, who for his piety, learning and vertue deserueth to be ranged with the formost. He was a man of that integrity, that his very enemies could neuer charge him with any crime truly. and yet was he reputed among malefactors, and after many wrongs, hard vsage, long imprisonment and scorne, was executed to death by vnworthy and base fellowes for the profession of his Christian faith. Parsons therefore hauing no iust matter, whereof to accuse him, obiecteth diuers friuolous toies, and impudent slanders deuised against him by his aduersaries. And first he telleth vs of his mariages, and how he caried his wife about with him in a chest, signifying that his dislike of popery proceeded of his affection to women. but the lawfulnesse of Priests mariages is already sufficiently iustified against the popish faction, and the wicked decretales forged vnder the names of certaine elder Popes refuted. No man certes did euer dislike mariage in any state of man, but either wicked heretikes, or bougerly Monkes and Friars, and luxurious and lecherous masse-mongers and their adherents. As for the tale of the chest, it is a forged deuise of Parsons himselfe. For neither could such a thing be, nor is the report caried with any probability. He saith that Cranmers sonnes wi-

dow

how reported this thing to diuers gentlemen, of whom he receiued it. But neither are we bound to beleeue, that she reported any such matter, which hapned long before such match, or that any honest gentleman would report any such fabulous and reprochfull deuice. But should any such thing be spoken; yet who knoweth not, how little credit is to be giuen to witnesses deposing in their owne cause, and speaking by hearesay, and after the relation of such, as shame not to forge any lies sounding to the disgrace of their aduersaries? Lastly Parsons in this report contradicteth himselfe. for in other places he saith she was caried about in a tronke. and heere he turneth tronke into a chest; and yet cannot turne matters so, as they cary with them any probable shew of truth. For suppose a woman should be put into a chest, is it likely, that the same should be committed to no mans charge, or that any would set the Chest vpon the end rather then the sect?

Secondly he saith, that from Cambridge he went to the seruice of Sir Thomas Bollein, and by his motion and suite was made Archbishop, and citeth for proofe Sanders de schismate. but first we are to vnderstand, that this Sanders was a parasite of the Pope hired to speake somewhat in his praise, and to raile vpon king Henry the 8. and his true friends and subiects. further it is probably to be suspected, that his railing booke de schismate was set out with an encrease of many lies by Parsons himselfe, and by his agents after the authors death. thirdly the story saith, that the king himselfe was the principall motife of his preferment. finally it is euident, that at what time Master Cranmer came first to the Kings seruice, that then Sir Thomas Bollein was in small reputation in the court, and by no meanes likely to be author of so great a preferment, as an Archbishoprick.

Thirdly he telleth, how hauing diuorced Queene Catherine from King Henry the eight, and maried him to Queene Anne Bollein, he auowed in open parliament and vnder his hand writing extant in publike printed record, that the said Queene (Anne) was neuer his true wife. and for this he citeth

teth a statute 28. H. 8. c. 7. an. 1536. and likewise by his testimony he would proue, that Queene Anne of Cleue was neuer the kings wife, nor known carnally by him. and for this also he citeth the statute an. 32. H. 8. c. 25. but these bold assertions so plainly conuinced by publike record doe shew, that the man hath passed not only all limits of modesty, but also of witte and discretion. for neither is any auowry mentioned in the first statute to haue beene made by the Archbishop, neither can his hand-writing bee brought forth proouing any such matter. only there is mention made of a diuorce betwixt the King and Queene vpon matter confessed and proued, and a plaine and simple declaration set downe of such matters, as then passed, and in that forme and stile, that best pleased the penner of the statute, and according to the practise of the Archbishops courts. in the second statute the Archbishop and synode testifie nothing of their owne knowledge concerning the lady Anne of Cleue, but only of her confession, and other acts iudicially passed in open court.

Fourthly he chargeth him with tyrannous dealing against Bonner, and Gardiner, and with running after the time, following the humour of king Henry the 8. and after that, of the protector for ouerthrowing K. Henry his will, & with Dudley for the ouerthrow of the Kings two daughters, and after that with Q. Mary for the ouerthrow of the D. of Northumberland. but first his charge of tyrannous dealing against Bonner and Gardiner is most ridiculous, the Archbishop being a man of milde disposition, and gentle nature, and the other being wolvish and cruell blood-suckers. Secondly his dealings in matters of state were not great; but yet he alwaies did the best he could for the good of his country, and followed neither times nor humors, albeit ouerswayed percase with both. Thirdly he never concurred in the ouerthrow of King Henries will. May in a certeine petition of lay-papists, they bragge that they cancelled King Henries last will. contrarywise, because King Edwards will contradicted the same, he refused to subscribe the same, vntill such time as lawyers resolued him, that he ought to doe it. Fourthly it is false,

that

that euer he concurred with any to diuerſify the Kings two daughters. May he refuſed to ſweare to the Lady Iane as Queene, though diuers Papiſts before him had done ſo. Finally if he ſet his hand, as other counſellors did, to certeine directions in matters of ſtate in preiudice of Queene Maries right, why is he only blamed, and all others, that did the like, excuſed? as for Stowes ſlanderous reports giuen out of this good biſhop, or rather the reports of malicious Papiſts vnder the name of Iohn Stow tayler, they deſerue litle credit, as proceeding from men of popiſh humors and tending to the diſgrace of religion.

Fiftly he calleth out certeine ſuſpitious words, as if that good father changed his religion with the time, and held the reall preſence, and had written bookes of that argument *pro* and *contra*. he addeth further that Iohn Lambart, Thomas Gerrard, William Hierome and Anne Askew were condemned to the fire by biſhop Cranmer. and that he was cauſe of the making of the ſtatute in the reigne of King Edward the 6. againſt ſuch as ſpeake vnreuerently of the Sacrament, and that he wrote a ſpeciall booke of the reall preſence. But firſt it is no argument of inconſtancy, to ſuffer, not only loſſe and diſgrace, but alſo impriſonment, and death for religion: wherein his continuall oppoſition againſt the Pope declareth him to haue bene no changeling. ſecondly moſt falſe it is, that he condemned any of thoſe godly Martyrs aboue mentioned, as the records which are publikely to be ſeene, doe teſtifie. For Anne Askew was found guilty in the Guildhall at London by an enqueſt being endited vpon the ſtatute of ſix articles. But that is no place for good Biſhops to ſit in iudgement. The reſt were condemned likewiſe vpon the ſire articles by certeine ſpeciall commiſſioners, whereof that good biſhop was none. Thirdly it may be, that he was cauſe of that ſtatute, concerning the reuerend vſe of the ſacrament. But what is that to the reall preſence? Can no man ſpeake or thinke reuerently of the ſacrament of the Lords ſupper, but he muſt beleeue the popiſh carnal preſence of Chriſts body in the ſacrament? What ſimplicity is this

ſo

so to conclude? As for Bonners words, that charged Cranmer to haue written a booke of the reall presence, and Parsons his obiection of writing *pro* and *contra*; they carry with them no shew of truth. For against the Papists we find, that he hath written learnedly in the argument of the sacrament. but that he should write for them, it is either a mere imagination of dreaming companions, or a malicious fiction of professed enimies.

Lastly he telleth vs of the Archbishops recantation. But he should also remember, that he did openly reuoke it, with a publike declaration, that nothing did euer more grieue him, then his weakenesse therein. So much it did afflict him, that standing in the fire he first burned the hand, that had subscribed.

Further, not content to raile vpon that graue father and holy Martyr, Parsons runneth vpon M. Foxe for praising of him, and vndertaketh to refute that discourse, wherein M. Fox sheweth, that reuerend prelate to be a perfect paterne of a holy bishop. but therein he sheweth himselfe to be a perfect paterne of an egregious sycophant'scoffing, scorning, facing and lying, rather then refuting any thing said by M. Fox. First he saith he leaueth out the word *Pudicum*. But seing coniugall chastity is pudicity, it was no aduantage for him to leaue out that word, neither would he haue left it out, but that he tied himselfe to S. Pauls words to Titus, where that word is not to be found. He findeth fault also with translating the word ἐγκρατῆ *temperat*. But his skill in Greeke is not so great, as to make him able to controll this translation, seing as ἐγκρατὴς is not he only, that abstaineth from women, but that can master his affections, which is properly temperat. Further to proue, that bishop Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, and Rogers were not continent, he alledgeth, that euery one had his woman. But of B. Ridly he fableth. the rest had lawfull wiues and not concubines, as had Innocēt the eight, Alexander the sixth, Paul the third, and diuers other Popes and Masse-priests. May refreining from lawfull wiues diuers of them haue not only abused di-

uers

ners women, but also abandoned themselues to most vnnaturall lusts.

Secondly he saith, that M. Foxes discourse of bishop Cranmers bestowing his time is not sufficient to proue him faultlesse. as if a man well bestowing his time in study, and honest exercises were not farre lesse subiect to faults, then the lazy Popes, idle Monks and Friers, and their flagitious adherents, that are so farre from being faultlesse, that they are fruitelesse and shameleſſe.

Thirdly he telleth, that bishop Cranmer durst not speake against King Henry. But M. Fox proueth the contrary by diuers particulars, and Parsons by his impudent denials proueth nothing, but his owne malice and folly to be singular. Likewise he contradicted those, that gaue the chantries to king Edward in the beginning of his reigne, albeit his contradiction take no effect.

Fourthly he denieth that, which M. Fox reporteth of the bishops hospitality, and of the Lord Seymors complaint to the king against him. But it is an easie matter to say no, albeit twenty witnesses affirme any thing. Neither is a wife or children any hinderance to hospitality, but rather a furtherance, when the wife taketh charge of the house, and children require, that prouision be made more ample. contrariwise vnchast single Priests maintening diuers concubines waste themselues, seldome kep house, giue all to their bastards. That king Henry the 8. did fauour Cranmer and defend his cause against his accusers, and beare with him, albeit he could not be ignorant, that he had a wife, diuers did testifie beside M. Fox. In vaine therefore doth Parsons striue against truth and contradict so many witnesses.

Fifthly he auoucheth, that Cranmer forswore, and by solemne protestation abiured all the opinions and doctrine of the new religion: and that Cromwell did so also at the day of his death. but first this mention of Cromwell in this place is altogether impertinent. Secondly, it is false. For he said only, that he died in the catholike faith of the holy church, and did not doubt of any article of the faith, or sacrament of

the church. All which euery one of vs both liuing and dying doth willingly profesſe. Thirdly, he is ignorant, what is old, what is new, that either eſteemeth Popery old, or our religion new. Finally vnleſſe the man had forſworne all honeſty, he could not lie more diſhoneſtly, or deſperately, than in affirming, that biſhop Cranmer did forſweare the religion now profeſſed in England. For he denied only thoſe calumnious articles, that were put vp againſt him to the king, and not any point of religion.

Finally he denieth, that the Earle of Wiltſhires dog did take the Pope by the toe. But hee hath leſſe honeſty than a dog, impudently to deny a thing ſo conſtantly reported, and ſo ſufficiently witneſſed.

To conclude our diſcourſe concerning this holy Martyr, we may ſee by his example the indignities offred vnto Chriſtians by the enemies of true religion, and by Parſons a patterne of malice and rancor againſt truth, that raileth both vpon the liuing and dead, that any way fauoured truth.

This man thus being without all reſpect of age, learning, and other quality, murdered, it is no maruell if the bloudy Papiſts made hauocke of the reſt of Chriſts ſheepe. Rawlins White, Thomas Tomkins, M. Higbed, M. Cauſton, William Hunter, William Pigot, Stephen Knight, M. Laurence, Iohn Spicer, Iohn Mander, William Coberley, Richard Craſhfield, Cuthbert Simpſon, Hugh Fox and Iohn Deueniſh were likewiſe rudely handled, and in the end barbarouſly murdred for the profeſſion of the true Catholicke faith, againſt the pretended Catholicke Romiſh Church. Rawlins White after more then a yeares impriſonment was condemned by Kechin, calling himſelfe Biſhop of Landaff, and by him cruelly burned. A falſe Maſſe-prieſt being at that time ſet to preach, the ſaid Martyr did ſo confute him, as the record ſaith, that he ſtood mute. Thomas Tomkins was more than halfe a yeare kept ſtraitly in priſon by Bonner, and in the end condemned, and butchered by him. Neither content to take away his life, at one time hee buffeted him on the face, and at another burnt his hand with a torch, making

making a sport to torment the poore man. Such was that butchers mercy.

M. Higbed and M. Causton were men of good calling and estimation in the country: yet were they not any whit therefore respected, but for confessing of the truth, and detesting the errors of Popery, after much hard blage they were brought to a stake and there burned.

With like cruelty also was William Hunter, William Piggot, Stephen Knight, M. Laurence and the rest above mentioned murdered for the profession of the true Catholike faith against the abhominations of Popery. William Hunter for a time escaping the persecutors hands, they compelled the father to seeke out his sonne, to the intent they might murder him. Are not they then of that sort of men, of whom the Apostle speaketh 2. Tim. 3. That are without naturall affection? M. Laurence was so cruelly handled in prison, that he was not able to go, but must be borne to the stake, where God stirred vp the spirit of yong children to pray, that God would strengthen him. Iohn Deueniſh and others meeting for the exercise of religion were charged with treason. Cuthert Simpson was thrise racked in one day to declare his companions. Is not then Parsons ashamed to mention these holy Martyrs, thus cruelly murdered by his bloody consorts the ravening wolues of the Romish Synagogue? No, no; he is past all shame, and adding affliction to affliction goeth about to defame these being dead, whom the cruell Romish inquisitors persecuted being alive. In Rawlins White he misliketh, that he was desirous to heare the scripture read, and to search out the truth, and scoffeth at M. Fox, that reporteth this of him. But our Saviour Christ giueth Christians charge to search the scriptures, whom we are rather to heare, than this slaue of Antichrist. He maketh a iest also, where he heareth, that the said Rawlins bought a Bible for his sonne, and set him to schole. For he doth better like, that he should haue bought the tales of king Arthur, and the lying legends, and that youth should be nousled vp in ignorance. Finally he blusheth not to make M. Fox say, that

Rawlins vnderstood, that there were new doctrines stirring in King Edwards daies: which is a shameleſſe kind of dealing. For he neither ſaid ſo, nor could by any reaſon ſay ſo. He reporteth alſo, that Rawlins and his ſonne leauing their occupations fell to preaching. But his report ſtandeth on two groſſe vntruthes. For neither did they take vpon them to preach, nor did they leaue their occupations. Would Parſons leaue his occupation of lying, it would be more credit for him.

Speaking of Tomkins he ſcoffeth at his beard, and ieſteth, becauſe it is ſaid, that he began alwaies his worke with prayer. A probable argument, that ſince molting time Parſons hath had no beard, and that he vſeth not to begin his workes with prayer. If he did, his works would be better, and haue better ſucceſſe. He ſaith alſo, that Tomkins beleeued, that baptiſme was not good, vnleſſe it was miniſtred in the vulgar tongue. A manifeſt and ſclanderous vntruth. For he ſaid only, that it ought to be miniſtred in a tongue vnderſtood, and without the Romiſh ceremonies. In the end he telleth, how Bonner was forced to burne him ſore againſt his will. So he may ſay theeues be forced to ſteale and cut mens throts full ſore againſt their wils. If Bonner, certes, had beene vnwilling, Parſons cannot tell, what ſhould, or could haue forced him thus to murder Chriſts lambes.

Againſt M. Higbed and Cauſton he hath nothing to ſay, but that they approued M. Barnes, M. Frith, and Thomas Gerrards doctrine, whereof the firſt was a Lutheran, the ſecond a Zuinglian, the third betweene both, as he ſaith. But theſe are termes of his owne ſpitefull malice. If they had taught contrarie, they could not, certes, haue approued their doctrine. For contraries cannot ſtand together. He telleth alſo, how they depended only on their owne reading of ſcriptures, and the expoſition thereof. but this is direct contrary to that, which he ſaid before. For if they depended only on their owne reading and expoſition, how could they approue the doctrine of Barnes and Frith? Againe, let all indifferent men iudge, whether theſe holy Martyrs did not more wiſely

ly

ly in approuing the doctrine of learned, and godly men grounded on scriptures, then the simple Papists, that beleeue vnlearned and vngodly Popes teaching their owne fancies, and counterfeit traditions.

With William Hunter he findeth fault, that he read in the bible, and that he became a disputer about the reall presence. But all this disputation was nothing, but an answere to the bloody bishops articles, and a declaration of his faith. And I hope Parsons, when he is better aduised, will not condemne reading of scriptures, that dare not condemne the reading of leud legendes, and Popish decretales. The Apostle, certes, commended Timothy 2. epist. 3. for that he had knowen scriptures from his childhood. He doth scoffe also at the miraculous breaking out of the Sunne, out of a darke cloud, at the time of Hunters martyrdome. But seeing he maketh a custom to scoffe at reading of scriptures, and religion, it is no maruell if he iest at all things tending to the illustration thereof.

The greatest matter that he obiecteth against M. Laurence is, for that he intended to mary hauing beene a Frier. But the Apostle assoileth this doubt who saith, it is better to marry, then to burne in lust, as the sodomiticall popish Masse-priests, and Friers doe. He saith also, that the children that prated for Laurence were instructed. But I hope he will not reproue instruction in godlinesse. If he meane prompted to say so, it is but an ordinary figure of his lying and lose discourses.

Against Pigot and Knight he obiecteth, that they relied on that, which was taught them formerly by their preachers, But he is not very wise, to reproue them, that beleeue their godly and learned preachers, teaching them the truth out of Gods word, when the Papists beleeue the Pope, that oft is blind and vnlearned, and teacheth not, but only propoundeth to them foolish legendes and decretales, and such trash. He giueth out also, That they held a different beleefe from their fathers. But if he meane the Apostles, and ancient fathers of the church, he lieth therein

therein the father of lies. May we doe in nothing varie from our owne fathers, wherein they had not first varied from Christ and his Apostles, as we professe our selues alwaies ready to proue.

At Mandrell, Spicer, and Coberley he scoffeth, because they were men of trade. But as well he might scoffe at his putatiue father, who by occupation was a blacksmith. He laugheth also at M. Fox, that telleth how Mandrell was conuerted by the new testament translated by M. Tyndall, a booke (saith he) condemned by parliament. As if many were not conuerted by Christ and his Apostles, whose doctrine was condemned by the whole parliament of the scribes and Pharisees. Further that parliament is long since condemned and repealed.

In the acts of Crashfield speaking of holy Martyrs, he saith. They went drinking, if not drunke to these kind of Martyrdomes. But this scoffing at the witnesses of Christ Iesus doth shew, that he hath drunke deepe of the cup of abominations of the whore of Babylon. That Crashfield did drink at the time of his martyrdome, it appeareth not by the story, where it is said only, that one was apprehended, either for praying with him, or pledging him at his burning. Now Parsons should know, that a disiunctiue is true, if either part be true.

Against Hugh Fox he saith little. In the acts of Cuthert Simpson he toucheth only his deaconship, and a vision there reported. In his double calender he scattreth suspicious words, as if that holy Martyr had beene apprehended at Islington with others there assembled for practise of treason. But in the processe it appeareth, that all this treason was nothing, but an assembly for the exercise of Christian religion. Matter of treason was not so much as mentioned in the articles obiected to him. It seemeth therefore, that Parsons was not wise to talke of treason, when he and the Masse-priests haue beene such brewers and brochers of treason. Furthermore Rob. Parsons had no reason to reprehend those, that had the charge to ouersee the pore, saing the cruel

persecutions

persecutions of the bloody prelates had made so many needy and poore. Finally, if Robert Parsons will not beleeue the vision spoken of by M. Fox, that is so sufficiently testified; then haue Christians no reason, to beleeue the feined visions and apparitions reported in the Romish legendes, of which there is no ground, nor probable testimony assigned.

We say then, that these holy martyrs were all most happy to be vexed, persecuted, and slaine for Christ his sake. Happy I say were they, and there persecutors most vnhappy, and miserable. And as for Parsons, that goeth about to defile the ashes of the dead with the ordures of his vile reproches, it were good for him, that he had neuer borne borne, that spendeth his life in oppugning the truth, and railing at those, which haue giuen their liues for the truth. God giue him repentance, if it be his will, and if not, giue grace to others to be warned by his example, neuer to suffer themselues to be transported with the like hellish fury.

CHAP. IIII.

An answere to Parsons *his stiteſull notes vpon the actes of Martyrs and confeſſors ſet out by* M. Fox, *and in the calender referred to the month of Aprill.*

IN the examination of the acts of Martyrs, and confessors in the three monthes following Parsons talketh idely, as one hauing spent his store and strength before. I shall not therefore need to vse any long or curious discourse in answering such vaine and sollish trifles. Yet somewhat must be said, for that his spite continueth, albeit his store of calumniations is much consumed.

First he talketh of rubricated, and red coated Martyrs, and is very angry, that S. George is not set forth in Master Foxes calendar in red letters. But if he haue no more iudgement, then to wrangle about red and blacke colours, and

such like nifles, he may percase winne to himselfe a coat of greene and yelow with foure elbowes, the hood and cockescombe of the same. For well might he understand being often told him, that such matters were refered to the Printers and Correctors, and not wrought by M. Fox, upon whom notwithstanding he still dogorgeth his malice.

Secondly he taketh 8. Martyrs to take all at ons time. The first 8. Martyrs of this moneth saith he: and yet he reckneth but 7. to wit Robert Hatches, Nicolas Archer, Nicholas Haukins, Thomas Bond, Nicholas Wrigsham, Nicholas Langesdale, and mistresse Smith. So it appeareth, that the fellow speaking against innocents murdred for their Christian faith hath lost, if not all his wits, yet the facultie of numbring, which is no small blemish to the lustre of his wit. Nay, which is worse then the former, he seemeth to haue shaken hands both with shame and honest dealing, and to haue bidden them farewell. For he denieth, that these seuen were burned at Couentry for teaching their children and family the ten commandements, the Creed and Lords praier in English, and what is his reason trow you? forsoth first, because saith he, M. Fox citeth no author, nor register. next because the Lords praier, Creed, and Commandements were taught by euery parish priest in English. And thirdly for that scriptures were permitted by apporobation of the Ordinary. But in the first he abuseth his reader. For M. Fox alledgeth the testimony of Mother Hall, an ey-witnesse of this matter, and at the time of the edition of his booke dwelling at Bagington two miles from Couentry. He might also haue cited the record not mentioning any other cause, and the attestation of diuers of these parties friends, liuing at the time, when this was first written. The second answere is a meere falsehood. For euery old man knoweth, that in time past few parish priests taught, and few of the common people could say the Commandements, Crede, and Lords praier in English. The prouinciall constitution beginning *ignorantia sacerdotũ. de offic. archipresb.* doth leaue out the Lords Prayer, and 2. commandement, and mangle the rest, commanding onely, that

that the rest be declared in English once euery quarter.

The third allegation maketh against our aduersary. For if they that had scriptures in vulgar tongues without the licence of the Ordinary were excommunicated, as suspect of heresie, as is proued by the prouinciall constitution periculosa. de magistris: then no doubt, but these godly Martyrs, being taken with these vulgar scriptures, were first admonished, and being taken the second time were burned as heretickes. But be it, that it is somewhat more than law, to burne Christians for such matters; yet may we not thinke, that these butcherly murderers were alwaies so scrupulous, as to keepe within the precise limits of law. What law I pray you, did they regard, that in England falsified the act de hæretico comburendo, supposed to be made in Parliament in the time of king Henry the fourth, and in France haue so often massacred, men, women and children without forme of law, or punishment of the authours of these tumultuous disorders? But saith Parsons, Sir Francis Hastings and the minister were ashamed to bring forth so improbable a testimony. As if it were necessary for vs to know whatsoeuer is contained in M. Foxes booke. I do assure him, if I had knowen so much, he should haue heard of it before, albeit I suppose, now that he heareth it, he will not be ouerhasty to answer our arguments particularly. In his double calender he telleth vs, that they were burned for relapse into certaine heresies of the Lollardes. But other heresie, than aboue mentioned, he cannot specifie. True it is, that the Masse-priests caused their friends and seruants to giue out, that they were burned for eating flesh on Fridaie; a most hainous heresie. But that report is crossed both by the record, that hath no such matter, and by the deposition of the witnesses aboue mentioned. Thus you see Christians martyred for teaching Christianity in vulgar tongues, and you may not thinke, that the sheriffes forgat to seaze vpon all their goods, and to spoile them, their wiues and children. For that is recorded in the story.

Afterward he prosecuteth the rest of the Martyrs in order. And against Iames Baynham he obiecteth first, that he should

should say, that Christ was but a man, and that he had as leefe pray to Ioan his wife, as to our Lady. But heere the sycophant, as in diuers other places, taketh the obiections, or articles for his answers: a matter very much vsed by him against M. Plessis vpon farre lesse occasion. For Baynham, as the record of his examination sheweth, denied both resolutely.

Secondly he telleth vs, that Baynham confessed, that Christ is in the Sacrament very God and man in forme of bread. But out of these words fauourably construed can no other thing be proued, but that the bread is a sacrament of Christs body, which Christ was very God and man. Which vtterly ouerthroweth the popish reall, or rather carnall, and capernaitical presence of Christs flesh in the sacrament. We may therefore conclude, that this hellhound hath nothing materiall to belch out of his furious stomacke against this holy Martyr. But this innocents bloud vniustly shed crieth still for iustice against his persecutors at Gods hands: who although hee were a knights sonne, and a counseller at law of good reputation, yet was hee handled with intolerable indignities. For first hee was whipped by Sir Thomas Moore, then a great stickler in matters of religion. Secondly, hee was cruelly racked in the Towre. Thirdly, hee was condemned to the fire. Fourthly, hee was stocked, imprisoned, & whipped again. Lastly, he was burned or rather scalded at a soft fire. And this is al the account these cruel tygers make either of worshipfull, or base, if they come into their hands. But one thing may not be forgotten in this mans acts, that hauing his legges and armes burnt, he cried out to the confusion of all Papists, that hee felt no paine. Parsons will not beleeue this, albeit testified sufficiently. Why then should wee beleeue the lying legends without all attestation of witnesses or probability?

Iohn Aucocke was imprisoned for the profession of the syncere faith of Christ Iesus. There also either he was sterued, or otherwise brought to his end. Of this man therefore Parsons had no reason to make any mention, vnlesse hee had somewhat

so newhat to obiect against him. Therefore hee saith onely, that he was buried in the fields. But that is a faire testimonall against the synagogue of Antichrist, that maketh warre against the Saints both when they liue, and when they are dead.

Unto M. George Marsh, Parsons obiecteth first, that hee was a labourer of the fields, and doubted of the doctrine of the sacrament. But the first is refuted by the testimony of all, that knew him. For after he had well studied and profited in the Vniuersity of Cambridge, he returned home, and with diligent practise prooued an excellent preacher. The second hath no colour. For plainly he denied the Masse and transubstantiation. But at the first, it is true, that he answered as warily as he could, to keepe himselfe out of danger. All which availed not. For after long imprisonment, and hard diage, he was at length condemned by bishop Coates, or rather Pilate petticoat, a lecher and a vile man, that died presently after Marshes execution, and that vpon another maner of burning, as they say, than that of Marsh, as is testified not only by witnesses, but also by the markes of his euill kept virginity.

Against William Flowre hee hath somewhat more to alleadge, for that being a priuate man hee wounded a Priest at Masse. But no man could be more repentant, then he was for that fact, nor did his aduersaries so much mislike it, as hee did himselfe. Howbeit he was not executed for that act, but for denying the Capernaites opinion concerning the carnall eating of Christs flesh in the sacrament, and for standing against other Popish heresies. Wherefore as he dying for the profession of the true faith deserueth the name of a true and holy Martyr, so his aduersaries that burned him, and knocked him downe in the fire, as butchers doe their beasts, deserue to be reputed butcherly persecutors.

Speaking of Robert Drakes a holy Martyr, Parsons quarrelleth with his ordination. And his reason is, for that he was made Deacon by D. Tailor, and admitted minister by an order afterward established. But neither did D. Tailor any thing

thing without sufficient commission from the Archbishop, neither was his admission contrary to ecclesiasticall lawes, albeit the speciall forme was not yet established by statute. Wherefore vnlesse this sycophant can disproue any article of his faith, hee shall but striue in vaine either denying him to be a Martyr, or Bonner to be a bloudy persecutor.

Against William Tyms he scorneth more furiously, because he charged Bonner both with lying, and with forswearing himselfe. The first because he said, that Tyms was the ringleader of the rest, the second for that hee had broken his oath taken for the maintenance of the Kings supremacy. And for this also, as Parsons confesseth, Bonner called him busie knaue. Such is the moderation of these false Prelates.

But nothing hath he to obiect against either of these two, but that Drakes should say, he knew scriptures to be the word of God, for that they did shew vnto men the way to saluation, and reclaimed them, from wicked life vnto a pure and vndefiled conuersation, and that Tyms should hold, that scriptures were to be discerned by the spirit of God. And this hee endeuoureth to disproue. But while hee barketh against Christs Martyrs, he offereth also wrong to Scriptures, comparing them to apocryphall fables set out vnder the names of some of the Apostles. He saith also most falsly that Saluation is taught in the gospell of Saint Thomas, and the apocryphall Gospell to the Hebrewes, comparing the Epistle of S. Iames, and the second of Peter to these two apocryphall writings. He affirmeth further, that men are reclaimed from euill life by reading bookes of Philosophers. In the end of all he concludeth ridiculously, because diuers heretickes conceiue they haue the spirit of God, that therefore a mans spirit cannot discerne scriptures to be the word of God. But in Drakes his answear he leaueth out these words, vnto a pure and vndefiled conuersation, which would haue excluded both the apocryphall bookes of heretickes, and the prophane writings of Philosophers. His conclusion against the efficacy of Gods spirit in discerning scriptures is not better, then that, which euery Pagan may make, cõcluding, that euery Pagan thinketh

keth he knoweth the true God, therefore the knowledge of God proceedeth not from Gods spirit, or scriptures, that teach vs to know God aright. Finally he endeavoureth to charge Tyms with dissenting from Luther and Caluin, for that he said, that in the sacrament of the altar Christ is not present either spiritually, or corporally. But like a sallary he omitteth the words immediatly following, viz. But as they vse it, it is an abominable idole. Which words doe shew, that he spoke not of the sacrament of the eucharist truely consecrated according to Christs institution, but of the masse cake, that is o sacrament, but a mere idole.

Thomas Spurge, as he professed the Catholike churches faith, so constantly, and not insolently, as Parsons would haue it, he denied the false church, that is now visible at Rome.

Likewise did Ioan Beach, and Iohn Harpoole deny the carnall reall presence, and erring church of Rome. but saith Parsons they denied the Catholike Church to bee their mother. But he was blind, that saw not, how they meant and spoke of the moderne church of Rome falsely called Catholike.

M. Iohn Hullier, a faithfull minister of the Gospel, exhorted Christians, to separate themselues from the Popes marked ministers, such as Parsons is, and to continue in the profession of the true faith. For the which both he and the 4. formerly named suffered death constantly in sundry places. Rightly therfore are we to number them among Christs holy Martyrs, and not to doubt, but that they haue receiued crownes in heauen. What Bonner & their persecutors haue receiued, and what Parsons, if he repent not, shall receiue, it is easie to coniecture. For, as we read Apocalyp. 22. without shalbe dogges, and enchanters, and whore-mongers, and murtherers, and Idolaters, and whosoeuer loueth, or maketh lyes. Neither may Parsons thinke with words to excuse those wicked courses, which they take in all their actions, or that the words of persecuting prelats pretending sorow for executing Christians proceeded from their harts. Of course

courts they intreat the magistrate not to shed blod; and yet they prosecute men to the death, and massacre and poison such, as by the sword of their pretended iustice they cannot kill.

Christopher Litter, Iohn Mace, Iohn Spencer, Simon Ioyne, Richard Nicholas, and Iohn Hamon were all burned at Colchester in one fire, and for one syncere truth professed by them, and stoutly maintained against the errors of Antichrist. such is the rage of the enemies of truth. They care not how many they burne, so they may warme themselues by the fire. but saith Parsons, euery man may imagine, how these poore men may be imagined to haue vnderstood so wel these high points of diuinity. So, all his obiections doe consist vpon imaginations and conceits, and those of litle moment. for what he saith of these Christians, the same may be affirmed of the ancient martyrs of the church. For some were yong, others rude, and most very simple, but in the things of Christ. and yet they knew all things necessary to saluation: and well could they discerne betwixt idolatry and the true worship of God. God giue Christians grace as well to auoid the woluish cruelty of the persecutors, as these martyrs did know the abominations of Babylon.

Thomas Losby, Henry Ramsey, Thomas Thirtle, Margaret Hide & Agnes Stanly were persecuted to the death for the profession of the faith of Christ; and yet Parsons not content herewith, doth persecute them with his slanderous tongue now after their death. And first he goeth about to charge them with heresie. the seuenth article, saith he, was, that they held all things to chance by absolute, and precise meere necessity, so that whether a man doe well, or euill, he could not chuse, but doe so. The eight article was, that they held against the baptisme of infants, that none could be saued thereby, vnlesse he himselfe had yeares of discretion to beleeue, and wittingly to accept or refuse baptisme. But he sheweth himselfe, not only an absurd lawyer, but also a worse disputer, that chargeth the defendant with matters conteined in articles without proofe, and cannot distinguish betweene

betweene an obiection, and an answere, or resolution. But saith he, Fox proueth not, that they denied these articles. He imagineth also, that Bonner would not haue laid these opinions to their charge so publikely in writing, except he had sufficient proofe for the same. But this is too childish an imagination, to beleeue, that nothing is obiected in articles, but that which is true, and sufficiently to be proued. Secondly he doth desperatly speake vntruly of M. Fox. For as he take the articles, so also he take the parties answeres out of record. He addeth also, that some of these martyrs did acknowledge matrimony to be a sacrament. But that is not materiall, seeing all mysteries in a generall signification may be called sacraments.

Afterward he imputeth insolent behauior vnto Losby and Margaret Hide, and praiseth Bonner for his patience, and D. Darbishire for his learning, and for that he was admitted into the society of Iesus, and preached, and catechized manie yeares in Latine. But first it is no argument of insolency to defend the truth resolutely: which is all they did. and indeede such resolution shewed Margaret Hide in her answers, that Bonner was not able to refute her. Parsons he would make her to say, that the Bishop had dealt with her only about holy bread, and holy water, and neuer instructed her with any part of Gods word. But he falsifieth her words. For she said only, I would see you instruct me with some part of Gods word, and not to giue me instructions of holy bread and holy water. But had she said as Parsons surmiseth; yet is it well knowen, that Bonner was no cunning man, nor his crafts-master in handling the word of God. As for the praise of Bonners patience, it is a matter, that cannot be read without laughter. For if railing, faring, whipping, buffeting and killing be patience; then was Bonner patient, and not otherwise. D. Darbishire was knowen to be more learned in Darby ale, then in other matters. But were he learned, yet was he no fit companion for Iesus, nor was his French learning an argument, that he was learned being in England. Both these men we know to haue beene

persecutors

persecutors of Christs church. The rest, which our aduersary affirmeth, remaineth to be proued.

William Nicoll was butcherlike handled, and burnt at Herford west, for speaking certeine words against the kingdome of Antichrist. Shame therefore should haue forced Parsons, concerning this mans death, to kepe silence, but that fury and rage against the saints of God haue made him to neglect shame. Against him he bleth, first M. Foxes words: then he deriueth the mans simplicity. M. Foxe saith, he was a simple good soule, and by many esteemed halfe fooliſh. But God chuseth the simple things of the world, to confound the wise. Further he will haue them in derision, which shal deride the lambes of Christ. by this man we may see, that our cruell aduersaries spare neither wise, nor simple, but murder all, that open their mouthes against them. Further by the processe of this discourse, beginning with the month of January, we may perceiue, that they continue all the yeare in shedding of the blod of the innocent. God deliuer his church out of their blody hands, and binde their hands, that they may neuer be able to effect their intended mischieues.

CHAP. V.

Of the Martyrs and confessors registred and ranged in the moneth of May.

IN this flouriſhing month of May Parsons seemeth accordingly to flouriſh in lies and slanders. Against Iohn Husse a worthy Martyr of Christ Iesus perfidiously betraied, and cruelly burnt by the wicked conuenticle of Constance for the testimony of the truth, this worthleſſe wretch, and wretched slaue of Antichriſt obiecteth, first that he behaued himselfe seditiously before his comming to Constance. But this accusation is to generall. He must therefore shew wherein, and proue it soundly. Secondly, he saith, he was no witneſſe of Christ, nor of his doctrine. As if Iohn Husses doctrine of the communion vnder both kinds, against the tyranny of the Pope,

Pope, and the abuses of the synagogue of Antichrist were not the doctrine of Christ. Thirdly, he chargeth him with teaching, that private men may kill Princes, whensoeuer themselues iudge them for tyrants. But here the sycophant bewraieth his notorious, either negligence, or ignorance. For the conuenticle of Constance sess. 15. condemning this opinion doth not impute the same vnto him, but rather to some of their owne sect. If the men had condemned those, which thinke it lawfull to kill Princes either excommunicated by the Pope, or else reputed heretikes, they should haue touched the Pope very nearely and erred nothing therein. For to omit their cõmon doctrine, & practises herein, of late the Gunpowder-papists of England haue attempted to murder the King and his whole lignage, and all the Lords & Commons assembled in Parliament. Fourthly, he telleth vs, that he taught, that no man is a ciuill magistrate, prelate or bishop, so long, as he is in mortall sinne. But herein he sheweth himselfe more malicious, than his most captious aduersaries, who neuer charged him with any such doctrine. They onely charge him with speaking against the prelates of the church, and that very wrongfully. Fifthly, he saith, that a Bohemian named Rotenfish, studying in Oxford, caried home with him certaine bookes of Wickleffe. And this nouell he fathereth on M. Fox, who nameth no such man, nor mentioneth such a matter. Nay this name soundeth not, as if it were belonging to a Bohemian, but rather to some Dutchman. The tale is but a rotten deuice. Sixthly, he denieth, that an owle did appeare in the Synode, that was assembled at Rome by Iohn the 23. as Nicolas de Clemangis hath reported. He saith also, that this Nicolas was an obscure Wicleffian. But this is an obscure matter meerely deuised, or rather forged by Parsons, and contrary to the writings of Clemangis, that cannot stand with diuers points of Wickleffes doctrine. The other point bewraieth his impudency in denying that, which hath beene so long receiued, and by him reported, that had no cause to lie. Finally in his Warn-word, whereto he remitteth vs, he telleth most grosse leasings of M. Husse, and o-

thers. And vpon what ground trow you? Forsooth vpon the authority of Æneas Syluius a Pope, that had no reason to speake either against himselfe, or the papacy; of the conuenticle of Constance consisting of a packe of Scribes and Pharisies conspiring against the truth, and beleeuing euery word, that any of Husses enemies did vtter against him; of Dubrauius and Cochleus, two witnesses very partiall, and not to be esteemed the weight of a cockle shell; of prating and lying Prateolus, of blind Bernard of Luxemburg, and of such other Popish parasites, and professed enemies of Iohn Husse, and the truth. Beside that, he speaketh more vpon the head of his witnesses, than they euer durst speake themselues, albeit they speake farre more, than truth. Telling vs how Luther censured Iohn Husse, out of Cochleus lib. de act. Luther. an. 1519. he maketh him to say, that Husse and his doctrine neuer liked him, nor should like him; most impudently falsifying Cochleus his words, who neither nameth Husse, nor his doctrine: he saith only: *sic dixit, nunquam mihi placuit, nec in aternum placebit quodcunque schisma faciunt Bohemi.* Whereby it appeareth, that Luther, if Cochleus say true, condemned only the schisme of the Bohemians. Againe, albeit he condemned this schisme anno 1519. yet the yeare following, as the same Cochleus testifieth, he iustified the Bohemians.

Hierome Sauonarola with his two companions called Dominike and Siluester, although Friars, were no more spared, then other Christians, but because he preached against the Pope, the clergy and the abuses of the Romish church, and was defended by them, both he and his complices were done to death. The particulars by the Papists are suppressed, as much as possibly could be done, for feare of engendring a further flame. Yet out of our owne, and the aduersaries writings we may well gather, what the summe of his doctrine was. M. Fox out of Illyricus saith, that he taught free iustification by faith. And the same is proued out of his Commentaries vpon the 51. Psalme. Other articles expressed by Fox are to be confirmed by the rest of his writings, if the falsifying Friers by their expurgatory inderes haue

haue not taken the testimonies out. Thomas Porcacchi out of Iouius telleth vs, how he preached, that the Popes excommunications are not to be feared: which is the vtter ouerthrow of the Popes authority. Guicciardin lib. 3. hist. speaking of Sauonarola writeth, that he was charged with preaching against the Clergy. *Che scandalosamente predicasse Contra i Costumi del Clero, & della corte Romana, Che in firenze nutrisse discordie, Che la dottrina sua non fusse al tutto Catholica:* that is, that he preached scandalously against the manners of the Clergy, and of the court of Rome, that he nourished factions in the city of Florence, that his doctrine was not altogether catholike. But what the particular points were, he durst not expresse, albeit no doubt, but in articles they were fully set downe by the inquisitors. He saith further, that he contemned the Popes mandat and preached being excommunicat. Afterward he relateth how Sauonarola declared, that his opinions were grounded vpon the scriptures, and that he had no other end, but to procure a generall councell, wherein the corrupt manners of the Clergy, and the state of the church of God so farre passed out of order might be reduced, as much as is possible, to the likenes and state of times, that were next the Apostles.

All this, for the most part, Rob. Parsons like a wicked falsary, or rather like a false frier, leaueth out, and concealeth, and yet like a shameleſſe fellow blusheth not to charge M. Fox with the most shameleſſe fiction, as he termeth it, that euer was put in print. Yea I say, that at euery turne, bouncheth his owne fellow theeues, and Sanders a ranke traytor, and his booke of schisme either in part written, or published by himselfe, and Cochleus, and Bolsecus and Æneas Syluius, and Dubrauius, and Stapleton, and such other lying parasites, and his owne companions, cryeth out vpon M. Fox for vouching Illyricus, who notwithstanding endeuoureth to proue his sayings out of Sauonarolaes writings.

Nay where himselfe falsifieth Guicciardine, and lieth all maner of lies, he without all shame exclaimeth vpon M. Fox, whose plaine and sincere dealing is not only apparent in his

booke, but also iustified both by records and witnesses. These words, a great trouble began in Florence about this tyme; are added to Guicciardine. So likewise are these, and these among others were of the family of Medices. The excommunication of Sauonarola, and his preaching against the Pope mentioned by Guicciardine, he concealeth. Likewise he suppresseth that, which is layd of Sauonarolaes doctrine, and of his desire of a generall councell. Where he layth, three were tortured, he lyeth of two. Where he maketh Guicciardine to say, that he remoued from him all the slanders concerning his doctrine vpon his examination; he belieth his author. Nay contrary, where at his execution he saith, he left all men in suspense and doubt, it appeareth he saith the contrary of that, which Parsons maketh him to affirme. Nowil this be not falsifying, lying, and cogging; let his owne traytorous scholars iudge. The same man also continuing his lying saith, that no author maketh any mention of any article of religion in difference betweene Sauonarola and the Church of Rome. But I haue out of Guicciardine mentioned diuers articles, and namely concerning the Popes authority, his excommunications, generall councelles, and the deformity of the state of the Church in respect of antiquity. Parsons also himselfe (such is the force of truth) confesseth sufficient to proue, that he differed much from the Romish Church. For being degraded, and thrust out of the church, he confesseth, that he said, that he was thrust only out of the militant church. Which argueth, that he distinguished betwixt the Catholike and Roman church. For out of the Catholike church is no saluation. Further if these three men held not some points contrary to the doctrine of the Romish church, why did the Pope send inquisitors to hear their cause? Nay why were they burned? doth Parsons thinke it reason to condemne men to the fire, that erre not in any point of religion?

Frier Roy being here in England, left good testimony behind him of his syncere profession of the truth. And thereby we may also plainly coniecture, why he was burned in Portogal.

tugal. But no greater euidence can be produced, then the processe by the inquisitors made against him. Which the Papists would not conceale, if it made for them. Parsons therefore had no reason to doubt, whether he died for true religion or Iudaisme, but that with Iewish fury and hatred he doth persecute the professors of true religion.

Robert King, Robert Debnam, and Nicholas Marsh were executed as theeues an. 1532. yet was their cause nothing but their Christian zeale in burning a Rood at Douer court, where many simple people abused by the false packing of Malle-priests committed idolatry. But saith Parsons, they were notorious theeues and condemned for robbing of a Church. But how doth this notorious and traiterous sycophant prooue them theeues? Can he shew, that they did carry away any thing, saue that huge idol? Can he proue that they gained any thing, or take the value of one denier, or any thing else out of the Church, saue that wodden Rood, which was a scorne of Christian religion, and a meere deuice for the maintenance of Baals Priests: He can proue nothing: only he saith, that Christians made many oblations there. But assuredly they were very simple Christians, that offered to a peece of wood. Furthermore this is nothing to purpose, vnlesse he can shew, that these theeues take these oblations out of the Church. But that is a matter very vnlikely. For it is not like, that the cunning Priests of Baal would leaue any thing of worth in a Church, that alwaies stood open. Seeing then, that God requireth at the hands of his people, that they breake downe idols and deface their groues, and shrines, as we may see Deuter. 12. this matter of Douer court, will nothing hinder these theeues, but that they may well stand in the catalogue of Martyrs. But Parsons if he continue his calumniations, and yet bring no better shew of proofe; may serue, if not to stand for the Rood of Douer court, yet to palle for a wodden sycophant in the Popes court.

Against M. Cardmaker, Parsons faileth not to obiect his mariage. But that is nothing, but a pang of bastardly ma-

like against lawfull mariage. In Warnes the vpholsters story, he talketh of his pardon obtained of King Henry the eight. As if innocents vnlawfully called in question, or condemned, might not procure a pardon without offence, when as traitors and felons, and Parsons his consorts are not so zealous of martyrdome, but that they often sue for pardons.

Margaret Ellis died in prison, where she was committed for the maintenance of the true Christian faith. And so little pity had the cruell enemies of truth, that they had no care to relieue her being sicke.

At Stratford Bow anno 1556. Hugh Lauerocke an old lame man, and Iohn Aprice a blind man, were burned for denying the carnall reall presence of Christs body in the Sacrament. For Bonner had no respect either to rich or poore, perfect or defective, but all passed through the fire, that were not of his fiery superstition.

The same yeare Catharine Hut, Ioan Horne and Elizabeth Thacuell were condemned and burned in Smithfield, being willing rather to make a burnt sacrifice of themselues to the Lord, than to yeild to the abhominations of Popery.

At Gloucester chancellor Williams caused Thomas Drowry a blind boy, and Thomas Croker to be burned, much about the same time. And yet himselfe not long before had taught that truth, for which he condemned them.

The same yeare Thomas Spicer, Iohn Denny, and Edmund Poole were burnt in Suffolke. The principall cause of their martyrdome was the deniall of the Popish doctrine of the Sacrament of the altar, of the Popes supremacy, and such other Popish trash.

William Sleth also, that died in the Kings bench had, no doubt, passed that way, but that the Papists had famished him in the prison before. But dying in prison he escaped not their malice. For they denied him common buriall with other Christians, and left not to persecute him being dead.

Of these holy Martyrs Parsons speaketh his pleasure, saying of one, behold a wilfull creeple, and calling others blind

blind, poore, peruerse, and such like termes, as his malice suggested to him. Others he despiseth as being women and artificers. At some he iesteth for that they knew not the number of Popish sacraments, who notwithstanding, if they had béene asked any question of baptisme, or the Lords supper, or other point of Christian faith, could haue answered sufficiently. But what saith he against those holy Martyrs, that the Pagans could not, and did not obiect against the ancient witnesses of Christ, that suffered martyrdome for his sake? In the end he cauilleth at three of them, because one article obiected to them was, that no mortall man had freewill in himselfe to doe good or euill. But he sheweth himselfe more then simple, that chargeth men with articles, not being able to shew any such answeres.

Wherefore as we are to reuerence the memories of such godly Christians, so willingly giuing their liues for the testimonie of the truth; so I doubt not, but all good Christians will daily more and more detest the execrable proceeding of their bloody persecutors, that most cruelly murdered them. We hope also, that all moderate men will abhor the dealings of this wicked sycophant, who scoffeth and rayleth at the memories of godly Christians, whom his consorts before time haue most iniuriously slaughtered.

William Morrant, Stephen Gratwicke, and one King were first scoffed at, and then condemned by those, which had no sufficient authority. In the end they were burned in S. Georges field an. D. 1557. And so for denying a supposed body in the sacrament, to saue their soules, they were content to lose their owne bodies. Of the same cup also one Thurstone had drunke, but that he died in the castle of Colchester, where he was imprisoned for the faith of Christ Iesus.

William Seaman, Thomas Carman, and Thomas Hudson were called in question for their faith by the Commissary Bery, and were condemned and burned at Norwich an. 1558. likewise William Harris, Richard Day, and Christian George suffered death at Colchester for the same cause. neither did these tyrannical persecutors content themselues with

the shedding of the blod of these innocents, but they did also ver their wiues, children, and friends, and make spoile and hauocke of their goods. Seamans wife had left vnto her some corne, cattell and other stuffe for the sustenance of herselfe and three small children. But Christopher Coles being Lord of the towne, where she dwelt, sent his officers and seruants to seaze vpon all. And this is the compassion and iustice of Papists.

Against all these Robert Parsons seeketh all corners, if he can find any matter that might serue to calumniate them. But he laboureth in vaine. Speaking of Gratwike; hereby, saith he, we may perceiue, that he was a seditious fellow, and meant to raise tumults against the Bishops. But he is not able to charge him either with seditious act, or word, or any meaning to raise tumults. Only he telleth vs, how he desired God, not to lay his blod to his persecutors charge. But that was a praier, as well beseeming a Christian Martyr, as the proud words, false accusations, and out-cries of his persecutors did fit the enemies of truth. He addeth also, that he and his two companions were burnt in S. Georges fields to auoid tumult. But who euer said so, or thought so, but himselfe, and that vpon meere malice, without all colour of truth, or word of any witnesse? But if these peaceable men had beene such fellowes, and meant to raise tumults, then had no place beene fitter for them, then S. Georges field, being a fit place to meete in, both from the City and country, and farre from the forces of the City, that were fittest to represse tumults. In the meane while see the wisdome of Parsons, that sheweth the rigour of the cutthroate and butcherly prelats to be such, that they feared an vprore among the people.

Parsons calleth Hudson a mad martyr, for that he forsoke his house, and being in danger to be apprehended gaue himselfe to praier, reading and singing of Psalmes, hauing by great labour and diligence learned to reade some few yeares before. But therein he rather bewraieth his owne madnesse and folly, who raileth at such, as he is not able to spot with any crime, and for want of crimes obiecteth matter of commendation,

mendation, as zeale in religion, diligence in praier, courage in tribulation, and such like.

Lastly he scoffeth at one Richard George the husband, as he calleth him, of two martyrs, and one confessor. But all wise men wil acknowledge, that it deserueth commendation, when a husband doth so instruct his wiues, that he maketh them willing and ready to suffer martyrdome for the name of Iesus. Furthermore, I hope, he will not fall into Montanisme, and condemne second and third mariages.

Thus we may conclude, that Parsons seeking for matter against Christian Martyrs, and finding none, is not vnlike the chiefe Priests of the Iewes, and councell, that sought for witnesse against Iesus to put him to death, but found none. But in this he sheweth himself although not lesse malicious, yet more foolish than they. For seeking to disgrace them, he alleadgeth diuers things, that deserue rather commendation.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Martyrs and Confessors of Christs truth against Popery, referred in the calender to the month of Iune.

AS M. Hierome of Prage is the first man in the list of Martyrs of this month, so is he the first, against whom, Rob. Parsons in his tenth chapter beginneth to barke. But little doth the yalping of this curre against so excellent a man auaile himselfe, or his consorts. For whether we respect his life, or his death, his learning, or grauity, or constancy, the man deserueth singular commendation, if not admiration. In the Synode at Constance, he challenged all his accusers, and by a publike intimation vnto them signified, that he was ready freely, and of his owne wil to come to Constance, there to declare openly the purity and syncerity of his true faith and innocency before the whole Synode. Comming before the councell he defended himselfe with that eloquence and grauity, that his very aduersaries did admire him, and giue attestation of his rare parts. All this notwithstanding his aduersaries

uersaries preuailed against him, and his wicked and partial iudges condemned him, and caused him to be put to death: which he suffered with that magnanimity, that his aduersaries were stroken with admiration, and all pious men doe esteeme him an innocentand holy Martyr. Onely Robert Parsons and the Romish faction doth raile at him, and by all meanes seeke to discredit whatsoeuer tendeth to his commendation. But the discourse of Rob. Parsons is so full of lies and so vnprobable, that his friends cannot defend him, his aduersaries scorne him, as the most lying, lewd and foolish brabler of the whole packe of popish parasites. And that not without iust cause. For what, I beseech you, is more absurd, then in this cause to produce Æneas Syluius, Dubrauius, Cochleus, and others of that haire, for witnesses, that were parties, professed enemies, and hired with hope of reward to speake vntruth? *Lex Dei*, saith Athanasius, Apol. 2. *inimicum neque testem, neque iudicem esse vult.* that is, the law of God admitteth not an enemy either for iudge, or witnesse. beside that, sometime he blusheth not to falsifie the depositions of his owne friends.

First he saith, that Hierome of Prage ioined with M. Iohn Husse in a famous sedition against the Germane nation in Prage. But herein he reporteth a most famous leasing. For neither was there any such sedition, as by this infamous fellow is reported, nor doth it appeare, that about that time M. Hierome was acquainted with M. Husse. The first is proued not only by the words of M. Husses apology answering that article, but also by the testimony of Syluius hist. Bohem. c. 35. For the first theweth, that the German nation departed voluntarily from Prage to Lipsicke. The second saith, The Dutch did leaue the schooles, because they could not enioy their ancient priuiledges, as they were woont. So we see no seditious stirre nor enforcement, but that voluntarily they departed, and for that they saw their priuiledges infringed.

The second may easily be collected out of the words of the authors mentioned by our aduersary, who do not so much as name

name M. Hierome in all that business nor speake any thing of the familiarity of M. Hierome with M. Husse at that time.

Secondly, he telleth a tale, how Iohn Husse corrupted Wenceslaus with bribes, and how the King should say, whence was this happy goose borne, that laieth me such golden egges? but first this concerneth M. Hierome no more, than a tale of a tolled horse shod by Cowbucke the blacksmith. Next, the deuice is so foolish and improbable, that Parsons would neuer haue reported it, had he not beene more foolish, than his mothers gollings. For what meanes, I beseech you, had M. Husse being a poore man, to make the king such golden royall presents? Or what reason had he to be at such cost, if he had beene able to performe such gifts? If then any such golden egges were laid, it was by some goose Pope, or his agents, who are wont to worke by bribes, and golden presents.

Thirdly, he telleth, how Iohn Husse by reason of a certain contention with a Dutch Doctor began to rattle against indulgences, and the liuings of the Clergy. But this is a fiction deuised either by some Romish Doctor, or by this Popish Proctor.

Fourthly, he saith 24000. Germans departed from Prage, But Sylvius hist. Bohem. c. 35. mentioneth only 2000: so it appeareth Parsons addeth 22000.

Fifthly, he telleth how Wenceslaus was very glad, when the councell of Constance was begun vpon the yeare 1414. and carefull to haue the said Iohn Husse called thither and condemned. But this is also a matter absurdly forged. For not the solicitation of that careleſſe King, but the malice of the polthorne Priests of Baal was the cause of M. Husses trouble.

Sixthly, he shameth not to say, that Zizca was a rebell against Wenceslaus, whereas the crime of rebellion is rather to be imputed to the Romish clergy, and their adherents. For Subinco the Archbishop of Prage stirred vp Sigismund against the King, as Sylvius testifieth hist. Bohem. c. 35. and that king was taken prisoner first by his Barons, next by his brother

brother Sigismund, as is testified in the same history, c. 34. whereas all the warres of Zizca were rather against strangers, than others, and happened after the councell of Constance, and the kings death.

Seuenthly, he chargeth Hierome with proud and seditious behauiour. But this is refuted not only by the testimony of others, that witnesse his modest behauiour, but also by Parsons himselfe, confessing, that he offered most humbly to reuoke any thing saide by him, if it could be shewed to be erroneous.

Eightly, he imputeth vnto him errors concerning the Trinity. And his reason is, for that he vsed an vnfit resemblance of the holy Trinity. But if this argument be concludent, then doth the Romish church erre grosly, in matters of the Trinity, that doth paint the holy Trinity most absurdly; and the schole Diuines cannot excuse themselues, that doe picke out an image of the Trinity in mans soule, and in the faculties thereof, and seeke steppes and similitudes of it in diuers creatures, as appeareth in their Commentaries in 1. sent. dist. 3. as for M. Hierome he cleared himselfe of this slander, and offered to retract any thing, if it might be proued vndecently or erroneously spoken.

Ninthly, he mentioneth his abiuration. But that was a worke framed to his hands by his enemies, and read by him for feare of death, and not either made by him, or vttered with such vehement words and affection, as is pretended.

Finally he obiecteth out of the sentence giuen against Hierome of Prage, that he stood constantly in defence of the reall presence and transubstantiation in the sacrament of the altar. But if in any thing Parsons vseth constancy, it is in lying & slandring. For in the sentence there is no more but this, that as touching the sacrament of the altar, and the transubstantiation of the bread into the body of Christ, he doth hold and beleeue as the Church doth hold and beleeue, saying also, that he doth giue more credit vnto Saint Augustine, and other doctors of the Church, then vnto Wickleffe and Husse;

So

So it appeareth that Parsons reporteth the words of the sentence falsely, and that Hierome by the Church understandeth the ancient Church, and maketh nothing for the latter Church of Rome. Further, Parsons sheweth himselfe to be a man devoid of reason and sense, that would have vs to believe all things contained in the sentences of the Priests of Baal. He may as well alleadge the sentence of the Scribes and Pharisies against our Saviour Christ, and his Apostles, and of the Pagans against Christian Martyrs, and pray vs to subscribe to all the calumniations and false reports of our adversaries. Hierome of Prage therefore let him be remembred as a godly Martyr, and Parsons let him be reputed for a calumnious barkar against Martyrs. As for that masked fellow, that called himselfe Archbishop of Constantinople, and gaue sentence against him, together with that sinke of Baals Priests, that consented to his death, they now do well understand, what it is to condemne the innocent, and to acquite heretickes and traitors.

After Hierome of Prage doe follow foure other Martyrs, to wit M. Belenian, M. Lacels, Iohn Adams and Anne Askew, all done to death for the profession of the true Christian faith, and all resolute and constant Martyrs of Christ Iesus. How vniustly they were dealt withall, the whole processe made against them will declare. Anne Askew a yong woman of 25. yeres at the most, was diuers times imprisoned, hardly examined, taunted and scorned, and vnmercifully vsed. vpon the racke she was so haled, that she could neither stand nor goe after it. Finally she was conuicted vpon the bloody statute of sir articles, and after diuers indignities without any remorse or pity put to death. All which, though grieuous when it was acted, is lamentable now to be remembred, cannot content Rob. Parsons, nor his raging humor, but he must needs bestow some labour in railing both vpon her, and her companions in martyrdome. Let vs therefore consider what the wretched wrangler hath said against them.

First he saith, she left the company of her husband Iohn Kyme, and maketh, as if she were suspected of dishonest life.

He

He addeth also, how Iohn Bale calleth her iuuenculam, and plaieth with that word. But first to speak of the leauing of her husband, it seemeth, that he left her, and not she him, they two being rather contracted, then maried together. Secondly no man was euer able to spot her either with dishonesty, or lightnesse. and, certes, there is no congruity in this, that she, which gaue her body to be tormented, and renounced her life for the truthes sake, should abandon her selfe to follow carnall desires, whereby she must nedes lose Christ. Neither may we thinke it strange, that being on the racke she was asked whether she was with child, or not. For it is no strange thing, that the enemies of truth should aske questions tending to the defamation of the professors of truth. Finally M. Bale by Iuuencula vnderstood, that she was a yong woman in her prime. If any misconstrue words of doubtfull signification, shame come to him, that thinketh euill without cause.

Secondly he chargeth her to haue recanted twise publikely, viz the 20. of March 1545. and the 13. of Iune next following in the Guildhall of London. But if malice had his due reward; then such grosse and scandalous leasings ought publikely to be recanted. For the first pretended recantation was nothing else, but this subscription and protestation; that she beleeued all manner of things conteined in the faith of the Catholike Church, and not otherwise. Whereby it appeareth, that Bonner and his register did not a little wrong her to make articles, and to say, that the respondent subscribed simply. Of the second pretended recantation he can alledge no other presumption, but that she was acquited in the Guildhall, no witnesse comming forth to charge her, that she had spoken words against the sacrament of the altar. And he proueth his argument; for that it is not likely, that in matters of heresie she should haue beene acquited, except she had made profession of her faith to the contrary. But that which he affirmeth to be vnlikely, is by him imagined very absurdly. For in England, when any man standeth at the barre to plead guilty or not guilty, if no praise be brought against him,

he

he is discharged as not guilty, without other protestation, or any more adoe. And this I thought good to tell Parsons, to informe his ignorance, lest comming himselfe vnto the place, he should speake as he doth here, rudely and absurdly.

Thirdly he telleth a long tale, how King Henry being informed, that Anne Askew contrary to her othes and protestations did in secret seeke to corrupt diuers people, and namely the Queene, the Duke of Suffolkes daughters and others, he caused her to be apprehended and put to the racke. He saith further, that by her confession the king learned so much of Queene Catherine Parre, as he had purposed to haue burned her also, if he had liued. All which matters are so contrarie to the whole processe framed against her, that he seemeth to haue a steele face, hardned diuers times in his putatiue fathers forge, that durst without all testimony or shew of proofe affirme matters so false. For first, not the King, but the bloody Priests of Baall were the causes of her apprehension, and troubles. Secondly, neuer can it be proued, that this yong woman had accesse to the Queene. Thirdly, it is vncerteine, whether she was interrogated any thing of the Queene or not. Fourthly, no man liuing can say, that Anne Askew confessed any thing of her. Finally, if the King had knowen any thing by Anne Askews confession, he liued long inough after to haue taken order for it. But saith Parsons, it may appeare by that which Fox relateth of the Queenes danger. But in this argument nothing, but his superlatiue impudency appeareth. For Anne Askew is not once named in all that relation. Further he addeth these words, the truth is, that the principall occasion against the Queene was for hereticall bookes found in her closet, brought to her or sent her in by Anne Askew. But we finde by experience, that when this fellow talketh most of truth, then he mindeth most falshood. For in all the discourse concerning the danger of Queene Catherine Parre neither is it said, that bookes were the occasion of her trouble, nor that Anne Askew brought to her, or sent to her any bookes. So we see Parsons proueth nothing against Anne Askew. But it is by him confessed, that these

cruell

cruell wolues thinke reason to burne Quænes for hauing bookes against the abominations of the Romish religion, which bookes Parsons shall neuer proue to be hereticall.

Fourthly, most impudently he layeth to Anne Askewes charge proud & presumptuous answers; and saith, if she had liued few yeares longer, that she would haue come to the point of her deare sister disciple and handmaid Ioan of Kent, whom she vsed most confidently in sending hereticall bookes hither and thither. But of pride and presumption her modest answeres will discharge her. If she spoke boldly, her cause required it, and her innocency gaue her that liberty. As for Ioane of Kent she neither knew her, nor did she any time vse her, or send any bookes by her. May this Ioane was no woman to come in court, nor was Mistris Askew a disperser of bookes: which office, I vnderstand, some popish women somwhat too familiar with Masse priests haue lately vndertaken. But so often hath Parsons told this lie of Ioane of Kent, that if he liue many yeares, he will thinke to prescribe against truth. Only thus much he must know, that when he talketh of Ioan of Kent, he talketh of as honest a woman, as mother Cowbuck, and a diligent disciple of Antichrist and his complices.

Fifthly he calleth Nicholas Belenian, Iohn Lacels, and Iohn Adams scholars of this yong mistresse. Whereas he, though an old master of mischese, cannot proue, that before their condemnation she euer knew, or saw any of them, saue Iohn Lacels. But it appeareth, he careth not, what vntruth he speaketh, so he may speake wickedly and slanderously.

Lastly, whereas Lacels in a letter of his written out of prison detesteth the Masse, as the vnquietnes of Christendome, and a blasphemy against Christs blood; Parsons thinketh to picke some aduantage, as if he had thought, that Christ, when he sayd, this is my body, with one hand had pointed to his brest, and with the other holden out the bread. Whereas Master Lacels, where he said, that these words, this is my body, were spoken of his naturall presence, meant nothing else, but that the bread was a sacrament of Christs body then

at

at his last supper naturally present, and which was to suffer on the crosse, and that no man can say the words, and institute the sacrament in that sort that Christ did. and thus an end of Mistresse Askew and her companions, though Parsons make no end of cogging and lying.

Thomas Haukes was by his old master the Earle of Oxford betraid and deliuered into the hands of wicked Bonner, and by him wickedly and scornefully vsed, and at the last condemned, and committed to the secular Magistrates, who in the kingdomes where Popery raigneth are the Masse-priests hang-men & executioners. In his life he did constātly confesse the truth, and spoke many notable things against the abominations of Popery, and at his death shewed a notable example of patience, giuing a token to his frinds, what comfort he felt in the flames by his grace, for whose truth he suffered. all which things almost are passed ouer by Parsons in deepe silence, as making nothing for the aduantage of his bombasted cause. Only he snatcheth at certeine words alledged by Hauks out of the first epistle of saint Peter Chap.3. whereby he would proue, that Christianity doth not consist in outward ceremonies, as the aduersaries would make it. But the only fault, if any were, that Haukes committed was this, that he alledged not the whole sentence, which proueth his intention clerely, shewing that baptisme saueth vs, through the resurrection of Iesus Christ, not as it purgeth the filthinesse of the flesh, But as it is a demand or stipulation of a good conscience. So then as Hauks intended, not the bare outward washing, but the inward good conscience is that, which ioyneth vs to God. But saith Parsons, S. Peter assigneth an opposition betweene the different effects of outward clensing of the flesh by the Iewes washing, and the inward effects of grace, that worketh in vs a good conscience. and this he alledgeth, because if you vnderstand by the washing of water, baptisme, then Haukes did argue well. But it is most cleare, that Saint Peter speaketh only of washing by baptisme, and not of Iewish washings, of which there is not any shadow in S. Peters words. Parsons alledgeth for iusti-

ſtication of his ſelfish interpretation *Auguſtines tract. 80. in Ioan.* and *ſerm. 20. de verb. dom.* and *Baſil de ſpir. Sancto c. 15.* But he took theſe two fathers as it ſeemeth at all aduentures. For neither of them ſpeaketh one word of Iewiſh waſhings in the places mentioned. May Baſill ſaith plainly, that baptiſme is not the waſhing of the fleſh, but the demand of a good conſcience with God. *non eſt baptiſmus*, ſaith he, *depoſitio ſordium corporis, ſed conſcientiæ bonæ interrogatio apud deum.* Haukes therefore diſputed wel, and Parſons his cauill is not worth a ruſh. He denieth alſo very leudly, that Hauks did lift vp his hands aboue his head for a ſigne to his friends, & requireth witneſſes to proue it. But if Parſons were to produce witneſſes for euery thing he writeth, this only courſe would put him to ſilence, he not being able to proue any one of his idle tales, flowing like a ſwarme of drones out of his dry parched pate. this matter of Haukes M. Fox reported frō the mouth of diuers witneſſes, which he being aliue would haue named, if any had demanded the queſtion of him.

Thomas Wattes was burnt at Chelmesford, witneſſing with his bloud, as he ſaid, how abhominable were the doctrines of Popery. Little comfort therefore take Parſons to talke of this Martyr, whoſe innocent bloud lieth heauy vpon his bloudy perſecutors.

Likewiſe Iohn Ardley, and Iohn Simpſon, were butchered by the bloudy Bonner. They offered all their goodes, ſo they might enioy quiet of conſcience; and yet could not be heard. Which if the Papiſts, that pay or ſhould pay onely twenty pounds a month did conſider, they would more gratefully accept his Maieſties fauour, and ſee that they are better dealt withall in their idolatrous religion, than the true catholickes for the profeſſion of the true faith. So conſtant they were, that Simpſon openly profeſſed, that if euery haire of his head were a man, he would ſuffer ſo many deaths for the truth. this Parſons miſliketh. but what if he ſhould miſlike Chriſtian religion? not all that ſuch a wicked fellow miſliketh is therefore to be refuſed, eſpecially the man ſpeaking as a party, or rather a particoloured fellow. On the o-

ther

ther side see, I beseech you, the cowardise of that butcher Bonner, and his butcherly crew. When the Martyrs after their condemnation were going away, a multitude of people desirous to see them, made some noise, more then ordinary in the church of Paules. Bonner knowing what he had deserued, and fearing somewhat, out of his seat in the consistorie ranne in great hast, and not without a terrible apprehension of danger, to the backe doore, wherby he entreth into his palace. But he was too great to goe through the presse, and others desired to saue themselues, as well as he. So he staied much amazed, and his men cried, saue my Lord, saue my Lord. But they might haue said, with more reason, haue away the butcher, beware of the bottle of blood. And hardly at length did he recouer his owne doore, flying when none did follow him. Howbeit Parsons, to reuenge Bonners quarrell, taketh exception to the two Martyrs answeres, and saith they agreed not. But he is like that busie fellow, that seeketh a knot in a rush. For speaking of auricular confession, the one denied it, the other was not resolued in it. It might be, he thought the aduise of our spirituall pastors in some cases very profitable: Popish auricular confession he neuer approued.

Thomas Osmund, Nicholas Chamberlaine, and William Bamford after diuers examinations, and very strait imprisonment were at the length sent into Essex to be martyred for denying the popish reall presence, and other abominable points of Popery. Parsons saith, they went desperately to death, rather then they would relent in any of their opinions: for which they had no other ground, but their particular apprehensions. thus saith he, and so in old time did the Pagans thinke of Christian Martyrs, esteeming their resolution to be nothing but desperation, and saith to be nothing but opinion. but Christians know, that it was hope of eternall life, and not despaire of better in this life, that made them thus willingly to giue vp their liues. Furthermore we doe not relie vpon our owne opinions or apprehensions, but vpon the doctrine of the Apostles and Prophets contained in scriptures,

tures, and euer beléeued by the fathers and church of God. But the Papists indéede haue no other ground, that is certaine, but the determination of euery rude, ignorant, and impious Pope.

Thomas Harland, Iohn Oswald, Thomas Auington and Thomas Read after long and strait imprisonment in the Kings bench were burnt together an. D. 1556. and the cause was for refusing to allow the Masse, and other Romish superstitions and abuses. The same yeare also Thomas whood, and Thomas Milles were martyred for the like causes. William Adherall and Iohn Clement were imprisoned much about the same time, and for the same faith. But before they came to their triall, they died in prison. At Leicester also a Marchants seruant was burned, and for no other cause, then for that he refused to imbrace the false doctrine and superstition of the church of Rome. What then hath this parasite of the Romish Antichrist to obiect against these holy Martyrs? Foxeth in his double calendar he telleth of what occupation they were. But if men of occupation cannot be Martyrs, in what case should goodman Cowbucke his putatiue father stand? To others he obiecteth, that they were ministers. But this was the cause of Heywood of Netherstoy his founder, and benefactor, and percase his father. In his examen c. 10. he findeth fault, that M. Fox doth not set downe their opinions in particular. But that is nothing to the Martyrs murdred by his consorts and predecessors. besides that, M. Fox doth signifie, that the articles obiected to them were the common articles, which Bonner obiected to all, and that they all detested the superstitions and false doctrines of Rome. Finally great wisdome it had béene in these persecutors of Gods Saints, not only to haue suppressed their articles and answeres, but also all their acts and sufferings. For so neither the abominations of Babylon, nor the cruelty of the polshorne priests should haue béene so commonly knowen.

Henry Adlington, Laurence Pernam, Henry Wie, William Halliwell, Thomas Bowyer, George Serles, Edmund Hurst

Hurst, Lion Cauche, Rafe Iackson, John Derisal, John Routh, Elizabeth Pepper, and Agnes George were all burned together for the confession of the true Catholike faith at Stratford Bowe an. 1556. For now the butcherly Masse-priests began by heapes to slaughter Gods Saints. And so willingly did these lambes suffer death, that the women stood among the company vntied; and so constantly, that albeit the sheriffe told the one halfe, that the other had recanted, yet he profited no more by lying, then Bonner by cruelty. Against these holy Martyrs Parsons hath no other matter to obiect, then that they were men of trade; Pernam and Halywell being smithes, and others of other occupations, and that they agreed not in their answeres. But first their disagreement was not in any point of substance, but rather in the abuses of the Romish church, which some vnderstood better then others. Secondly manuall trades were neuer thought a sufficient exception against holy Martyrs in the primitiue church. Lastly Haliwell and Pernam were of the same trade with Parsons his putatiue father. He should therefore haue forborne to disgrace the noble trade of blacke smithes.

Thomas Parrat, Martine Hunt, and Iohn Norris died in bands for the testimony of the sincere and Christian faith. for the same cause Roger Bernard, Adam Foster and Robert Lauson were condemned at Norwich, and burned at Edmondesbury. For as the season of the yeare grew hot, so the burning furie of Popish inquisitors grew hoter and hoter.

Water Appleby and his wife, and Edmond Appleby and his wife were all Martyred together at Maydstone an. D. 1557. O happie lone of men and wiues, who seruing Christ while they liued together, died also together for him! with them also, Ioan Bradbridge, Ioan Manninges and one Elizabeth a blind mayd suffered death for their constant confession of the truth. So it pleased God to reueale his truth to simple men and women and blind folkes, which the Papists wise and prudent in their owne conceit refused to know. All these were condemned by the furious suffragan of Douer, and a

cruell murderer of Christs sheepe. At Canterbury Iohn Fishcocke, Nicholas White, Nicholas Pardue, Barbara Finall, Bradbriges widow, Wilsons wife, and goodwife Benden by the same tyrant were condemned, and cruelly done to death: the good wife Benden being betraied by her owne husband, and almost sterued and poysoned in diuers lothsome prisons, but to her nothing so lothsome as the poysoned doctrine of Popery.

Thomas Moore for the same cause offered himselfe a burnt sacrifice vnto God at Leicester.

Richard Woodman, George Stephens, William Maynard, Alexander Hoseman, Thomasin Wood, Margery Morris, Iames Morris, Denis Burges, Ashdons wife and Greues wife, all in one fire, and for one truth suffered death at Lewes, anno 1557. Of which number Woodman was betraied by his owne brother and friends, and that was in him fulfilled which Christ said should come to passe to his Disciples, the brother, saith he, [a] shall deliuer vp his brother, and the father his sonne, and ye shalbe hated of all men for my names sake.

[a] Matth. 10.

Finally, Henry Pond, Reinold Estland, Robert Southam, Matthew Richardby, Iohn Floid, Iohn Holiday, and Roger Holland being brought before Bonner, the Popes slaughterman, for the testimony of their syncere profession, were imprisoned, scorned, derided, and at length according to the practise of polshorne Prelates, most cruelly murdred. Neither did they spare any, whom by any meanes they could get within their danger, purposing, as it seemeth, after the destruction of Christs sheepe to establish the kingdome of Antichrist, and there to rule all at their owne pleasures. But so did not the Apostles nor their successors. For they were sent to teach, and to administer the Sacraments, and not to famish, kill, and massacre Gods people. The ancient fathers of the Church by disputations conuinced heretickes, and corrected them for their amendment, and did not murder and massacre innocent Christians.

Finally, the Church, as a mother, ought to tender her children, and not as the whore of Babylon doth, to seeke to murder

der them. Robert Parſons gladly would haue all murdred. But when he can do no further miſchiefe, he raileth at them, whom his predeceſſors already haue maſſacred, and ſome he calleth fooles, and madmen; others he ſcorneth, as ignorant and baſe people. But that is the opinion, that prophane men haue of the children of God, and thus were the Saints of God ſcorned in old time.

At Edmund Allen he laugheth, for that being a miller he is ſaid by Scriptures to haue confounded his aduerſaries. But he might haue conſidered, that the word of God is the ſword of the ſpirit ſufficient to ouerthrow all hereſies, and that God doth giue grace to his ſeruants, that profeſſe his name, to anſwer prudently, and that he confoundeth the conceited wiſe in their owne deuiſes.

He ſaith, that Bendens wife was accuſed by her huſband for her vnquiet ſpirit, and findeth fault for that at her death ſhe left behind her ſome memorials to her friends. But he forgetteth to tell, how ſhe was betraied by her own huſband, and how he offered to cary her to priſon. He ſhould alſo haue remembred, that it is a naturall affection, which one friend beareth to another, to deſire by ſome token to be remembred. That certes which ſhe did, could not proceed of lightneſſe, ſeing moſt voluntarily ſhe renounced her ſelfe, and the world, and gaue her life for the truth.

In the examinations of Woodman he is not aſhamed to report the railing termes of D. Story, which argue, that hee was a woolfe, rather than a Chriſtian. He commendeth alſo White of Wincheſter, and Chriſtopherſon of Chicheſter, that condemned Woodman, and others to the fire, for their mildneſſe. But if Parſons had beene by them condemned to the fire, albeit he farre better deſerued it, than Woodman; he would haue changed his ſtile, and accompted them very fierce and cruell.

Finally he denieth, that they, that were burnt at Lewes, were put to death without a writ de hæretico comburendo, and endeuoureth to finde ſome differences in the Martyrs anſwers. But the time betwixt their condemnation, and

execution was so short, that no such writ in the meane time could be procured. As for the differences in their answers they rather concerne the foleries of the Romish schoolemen, which euery one doth not know alike, than any point of the Christian faith.

Seeing then the holy Martyrs, that of late time haue giuen their liues for a testimony against the abhominations of Antichrist, haue suffered death so patiently and constantly; their memory let it continue blessed, and endure from generation to generation. Seeing the rage of Baals Priests, and their adherents, and their persecutions haue appeared so extranagant; let their cruelty and impieties be remembred, and detested of all nations. Finally, seeing Parsons like a wicked sycophant hath detracted from their praises and insulted ouer the flame for Christs name, and maintained the barbarous cruelty of the Pope and his complices; let him either repent in time, or els rest assured, that he shal neuer haue part with christian Martyrs, nor escape the vengeance due to inquisitors and bloody persecutors.

The

The ſecond Booke containing an examination of ſome part of the *Romiſh Martyrologies and Calendars, and the impious* doctrine and practiſe of Papiſts in the *worſhip of Saints and* Angels.

CHAP. I.

The examination of the doctrine and acts of Martyrs, and others regiſtred in old Calendars and Martyrologies of Papiſts, and worſhipped by them in the moneth of Ianuary.

THe wicked and idolatrous worſhip of Angels, and Saints, taught and practiſed by the church of Rome, and by ſword, fire and fraud now obtruded vpon many Chriſtians, although by many and invincible arguments it may be refuted; yet is not in the opinion of the multitude by any demonſtration more clearely to be convinced, then by the fooleries, vncertenties, contradictions, and abſurdities of the Popiſh calendars, Martyrologies, and legendes. Seeing then Robert Parſons hath ſhewed himſelfe ſo buſie in quarrelling againſt the calendar ſet before the booke of acts and monuments publiſhed by M. Fox, although it be not any act of ours, nor deuiſed by the author for the religious worſhip of martyrs; I haue thought it expedient for correction of his curriſh humor, to examine the Romiſh calendars,

dars, Martyrologies and legendes, and the doctrine and practise of Papists in their worship of Saints and Angels. The order of our discourse shall be according to the sequele of moneths, and daies, according as the registers of their calendars leade vs.

The first day of Ianuary is appointed for the celebration of the circumcision of our Lord. But the Romish Calendar and Martyrologe dedicateth the same to Almachius, to 30. souldiers slaine vnder the reigne of Diocletian, whose names lye hid in the Popes brest. He also can tell percase, for what cause, and by whom they were executed. For others can say but little of them. The same is also dedicated to S. Martina, to S. Concordius worshipped with great concord at Spoletum. in Cæsarea, as the Romish Martyrologe testifieth, they celebrate the feast of the deposition or buriall of S. Basill, in Afrike of Fulgentius, At Siluiniacum of S. Odilo an od Romish Saint. Almachius, as we reade in the Romish Martyrologe said, this is the 8. day from the Lords natiuity. Cease from your superstitious worship of idols, and polluted sacrifices. *Cessate à superstitionibus idolorum, & à sacrificijs pollutis.* This Martyr therefore, and those of his time were not of the Romish religion, that teacheth worship of idoles, and offereth sacrifices polluted with diuers superstitions, idolatries, and blasphemies, from which in old time Christians abstained, and that not without horror of them. Further by the writings of Basill and Fulgentius we may perceiue, that in those times neither the Popes monarchicall power, nor the carnall reall presence, nor the doctrine of transubstantiation was once heard of among Christians. Only Odilo the monke, that first instituted, as is said, the feast of all soules, stinketh a litle of Popery. And yet he knew nothing of the late schole doctrine, or the canons of Trent. beside that he liued almost a thousand and fifty yeares after Christ.

Thus we see the difference betwixt the old and late church of Rome. Beside that the notes vpon the Saints of this day doe discouer many abuses of the modern Romish synagogue. For first it appeareth, that the same worshippeth, it knoweth

not

not whom, as Almachius, & Martina not mẽtioned in any authenticall storie, and the thirty soldiours, whose names, religion, and acts are vnknowen. Baronius in Not. in Martyr. Rom. supposeth Almachius to be all one with Telemachus mentioned by Theodoret hist. lib. 5. c. 26. But the names agree not. Further, the one was stoned to death, as they say, the other slaine with the sword. The one was slaine by Alipius for speaking against Idolatry. Telemachus was slaine by tumult of the people for speaking against sword players, or gladiators. Secondly the Papists worship some for Saints, as Odilo, whose superstitious actions, and want of knowledge of Christs true iustice giue iust sulpition, that they are damned. Thirdly in their worship they ioyne mens feasts with the festiuities of Christ, which is no litle abasement to his honour. Fourthly they call vpon one Saint in one place, and in other places vpon other Saints. Neither is there any harmony or concord amongst them in their worship, such especially as ought to be among Christians, all concurring in the worship of one true and euer liuing God. Fiftly, whereas the bodies of Saints in ancient times were wont to be enterred, and not to be touched: now they change deposition, and burials, into eleuation and vnripping their toombes, Christian memorials into idolatrous worship of Martyrs, yea of such, as neither are Martyrs, nor Saints. Finally, Hierome in *epist. ad Chromatium*, saith, that no Martyrs suffered the first of Ianuary: how then commeth it to passe, that so many are worshipped that day? Baronius in Not. in Mart. Rom. answereth, that this epistle is counterfeit. But that doth rather discredit the rest of the fathers epistles, then answere the doubt. For be it counterfet; yet it appeareth, how that was a receiued opinion among Papists some time past.

Vpon the second of Ianuary, in the English Calendar, there is no Saint Macarius to be found. But Rob. Parsons playing sometime the gypsey, as the Romish Martyr Watson saith in his Quodlibets, of his bounty giueth the second day to this Ægyptian Saint. The Romish martyrologe sheweth notwithstanding, that he was worshipped onely in

a part of Ægypt, called Thebais, and ioineth with him all those Martyrs, which were executed by Diocletian for not deliuering into his hands the bookes of holy Scripture. The same addeth Isidore bishop of Antioch, and Isidore an Ægyptian Monke, Argeus, Narcissus, Marcellinus a child worshipped in Pontus, Martinian a bishop worshipped at Milan, Siridon a bishop, but we know not where, and others. And of Marcellinus they tell, that being prest for a souldier vnder the Emperour Licinius, he refused to serue, and therefore was long imprisoned, and beaten to death. In the Lombardicall Legend c. 18. We read, how the Diuell on a time came vpon Macarius with a mowers sithe (behold a Diuell terribly armed) and thought to strike him with it (see I pray you a simple mower) and in the end plainly told him, that he was ouercome by Macarius his humility. So now you see the humility and state of Monkes is taught and confirmed by their Master the Diuell. Other Diuels ranne from Macarius and cried out, *victisti nos domine*, You haue ouercome vs, my lord Abbot. So the Diuels are now become witnesses for Monks.

Yet the matter is not so cléere, that we can easily yéeld to these Martyrologies. For first Baronius in his notes vpon the Romish Martyrologe, séeing there were diuers, that had the name of Macarius, doubteth, which Macarius is to be worshipped, nay it is much to be feared, lest the Papists for a Saint, worship an Origenian hereticke. For Hierome epist. 16. signifieth that Macarius a Monke, that was Ruffines scholar was an Origenian hereticke. *Tunc discipulus dulcior, & verè nominis sui, si in talem magistrum non incidisset*, saith Hierome speaking of Macarius. Likewise Isidorus an Ægyptian Monke was an hereticke, as Hierome epist. 61. ad Pammachium testifieth. But héere he is registred for a Saint.

Secondly, these Martyrologies tell vs diuers absurd tales. In Macarius his Legend nu. 18. hist. Lombard. we read, that he lying vpon the body of a dead Pagan, for want of a fether bed, there was a Diuell in the dead body so feerely prest

preſſed, that he was much pained, and yet could not depart. Where note, I beſech you, how this monke did not caſt out diuels, but rather kept them in mens bodies. Further they call Marcellinus a child, and yet ſay, he was preſſed for a ſouldier. A ſtout child he was, belike. Diuers other ſuch abſurd tales are found in the Saints legends. Thirdly we call them Martyrs, that die for Chriſt. But Marcellinus is reputed a martyr for refuſing to ſerue the Emperor. Fourthly it is abſurd to worſhip men, that either neuer were in the world, or elſe are not knowen, what they were, or what faith they profeſſed. In the firſt caſe is Iſidore Biſhop of Antioch; and Martinianus of Milan. For in neither place is any ſuch found to haue bene biſhop. Baronius therefore for Martinianus writeth Maternianus. In the ſecond caſe are Narciſſus and Argeus, S. Siridon and moſt of the reſt. For there is no memoriall left, for what articles of faith they died. Finally theſe Saints that would rather die, then deliuer vp the bookes of holy ſcriptures to be burnt, are not of the Popiſh religion; for Popiſh biſhops haue burned ſcriptures; theſe haue ſuffered themſelues rather to be burned, then to deliuer them vp into perſecutors hands. And if they ſay, that the ſcriptures burned by them, were full of errors in the tranſlation, they alledge nothing, but that, which by the Pagans, that burned ſcriptures, may with like reaſon be alledged.

The third day of Ianuary by Parſons is aſſigned to Anterus the Pope. Is not he then, trow you, a proud fellow, that taketh vpon him to Saint his holy father; and to put him in the Engliſh calendar, which in old time had no ſuch Saints? Further he ſheweth himſelfe as falſe as proud: For he ſaith he was Martyred by the preſident of the Emperour Iulius Maximinus. And why? forſooth, ſaith Parſons, for being zealous in gathering Martyrs acts. But neither the Roman Martyrologe, nor Vſuardus, nor any authenticall writer doth mention either any ſuch preſident, or any ſuch cauſe of Anterus his Martyrdome.

The Roman Martyrologe with Anterus ioyneth S. Peter, that

that was crucified at Aulona, Cyrinus, Primus and Theogenes martyred in Hellespont, S. Daniel of Padua and others. Vsuardus doth tell vs, that S. Genoueua is worshipped among the French. finally Molanus addeth the solemnity of the finding of the body of S. Quintin, and the bringing backe of the head of S. Iames.

So we see first, that there is no consent among these saint-worshippers, not only euery countrey and city, but also euery particular Christian worshipping seuerall saints. The greate Parisian Saint Genoueua is not once mentioned in the Romish Martyrologies. Which sheweth, that either saints were canonized in time past without the Popes authority, or that the Papists worship those, which are no saints. Secondly, albeit Baronius haue sought all corners for the iustification of the Romish saints, yet can he not tell vs, either what these saints were, or shew vs any authenticall writer, that mentioneth either S. Peter of Aulona, or Primus, or Cyrinus, or S. Daniel of Padua, or S. Quintin. Thirdly the legends of these Saints are so full of fables, that it is a matter of great patience to heare them, and very absurd to beleeue them. Petrus de Natalibus lib. 2. leg. 38. telleth vs, how the mother of Genoueua striking her, was her selfe striken blind, and that Genoueua cured her by casting water into her eies. A man may as easily beleeue, that Parsons being strikē blind, one of his scholars may cure him by casting salt into his eies. It is reported also, that Genoueua being leprous was at length cured by Christ himselfe appearing to her. He had nede to haue a leprous soule, that beleeueth these fond fables. Daniel of Padua, as is said, appeared twise to a blind man. But it may be a great question, how the blind man without his eies, could behold this saint. The Lombardicall legend nu. 155. telleth, how the president after diners tortures cast chalke, vineger and mustard into the mouth of S. Quintin. *calcem, acetum & sinapium in os eius proiecit.* There also we read, that he drone two nailes through his head, that were so long, that they came to the calues of his legges. And Lastly, that his body being cast

cast into a riuer lay there 55. yeares incorrupted. Which if Parsons beleeue, he deserueth to haue his mouth stopped with vineger and mustard, and to eate chalke for cheese. Finally it is not certeine, if any such men were euer, that they died for the faith of Christ. This is only certeine that Anterus Bishop of Rome had no gard of Suizars, nor triple crowne, and that neither he, nor any of his time beleeued the Popish carnall reall presence, or that Christs body is really offered for quicke and dead lurking vnder the accidents of bread and wine, or any point of Popery denied by vs.

Vpon the fourth day Parsons hath placed Titus S. Pauls scholar. But he maketh himselfe somewhat too bold, to alter the popish calendar of England, that admitteth no such saint. Besids that, Titus neuer learned nor heard any word of purgatory, indulgences, or the Popes supernumerary sacraments, or other Popish trash. May it is apparent, that he beleeued, that a Bishop must be the husband of one wife, fit to teach, and vnreproueable, and that the grace of God is his fauour towards mankind, and that Christians are to submit themselues to principalities and powers, that is, to kings and princes. For so the Apostle taught Titus. But the Papists teach contrary. For they make Bishops to forswears wiues, and winke at Halle-priests keping whores. They teach also, that grace is either charity, or not distinct from charity, and yet without charity set on assassins to murder princes, and moue subiects to rebellion. May to vndermine the state, and to blow vp the King and Nobles with gunpowder. Finally the Pope and his crew of false bishops teacheth not, and most of them are vnfit to teach.

With Titus, the Romish Martyrologe matcheth S. Rigobert, and Gregory Bishop of Langres, men albeit not so corrupt, as moderne Papists, yet nothing equall to Titus, either in purity of life, or sincerity of doctrine. Therein also we find a list of vnknowen saints, as Priscus, Priscillianus, Benedicta, Darfosa, Hermes, Caius, Aquilinus, Geminus, Eugenius, Quintus, Theodotus, Trypho. But neither doe authenticall histories mention these saints, nor assure vs,

that

that they died for Christ. Petrus de Natalibus lib. 2. c. 44. saith Darfosa was wife to Fabian Bishop of Rome. Which, albeit denied by Baronius, is also signified by the Romish Martyrologe. When Parsons then shall be heard to raile vpon maried Priests, it must be remembred, that he touched the ancient and best bishops of Rome.

The fift day of Ianuary is appointed by our english calendar to the octaues of Thomas Becket, a man slain not for religion, but about a quarrell concerning the priuileges of polshorne theeues and murderers, and a trecherous stirrer against his King and countrie. Thenalso is king Edward the confessor remembred, but a confessor neuer called in question for religion. The Romish Martyrologe addeth the Martyrs executed in the prouince of Ægypt called Thebais vnder Diocletian. But who they were, and how many, it is not certaine. There also Symeon Stylites, Syncletica, and Æmiliana are remembred.

Molanus encreaseth the number of Saints adding S. Gerlac to the rest, who of a Souldier became an Heremite. But the principall Saint honoured by Parsons is Telesphorus. The Spaniards this day celebrate the feast of Theodora a Virgin and Martyr, but when and how, God knoweth.

So we see the prayers of Papists are like to a blacke Sanctus, the Italians calling vpon one Saint, the Spaniards vpon another, the English vpon a third, the French vpon a fourth, the Dutch vpon a fift, and euery nation hauing their peculiar Saints.

Further, we doe not see, that either Telesphorus, or any of these Saints were acquainted with the hotchpot of schole-diuinity, or Popes decretales. There is a decretale concerning the Lent fast, and celebrating Masse in the night, attributed to Telesphorus; but he is blind, that doth not see that decretale to be counterfet. The very Romanists themselues obserue it not. King Edward and Gerlac, although they liued in the times of superstition, yet did they not receiue or know all the abhominations of the Masse, or of the doctrine of Trent.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, it were a hard taske to impose vpon Christians, to beleeue all that is reported in the acts of these Saints. Iohn Capgraue saith, that one Brithwald saw when S. Peter anointed King Edward with his owne hands, and commended to him continency. Being made king it is said, that he loked on, while a theefe stole his treasure, and let him carry it away. After marriage it is said also, that he and his wife liued chast, although they lay together. But if he meant to liue without the vse of marriage, why did he marry? if he meant to abstaine from his wife, why did he lie with her? When he was in England, it is said, that he saw what was done in Denmarke.

Finally it is said, he saw the Diuell daunsing on the tribute mony, that was to be paid to the Danes. Matters very strange and not to be beleeued of any sober Christians.

Symeon Stylites, as Petrus de Natalibus lib. 2. c. 45. recounteth, stood a whole yeare vpon one foot, and diuers yeers vpon a pillar, and in a ditch. But to what purpose, it passeth Parsons skill to tell. Ancient Martyrs were not honoured for standing on one foot.

In S. Gerlacs Masse, they say with a low voice, Saint Gerlac pray for vs. And why in a low voice trow you, but lest the Pope should heare it, who hath gotten nothing for his canonization? Molanus in indiculo saith, he is famous for doing many miracles. But what miracles, we know not.

The Epiphany is passed ouer by Parsons with great si- IAN. 6.
lence. yet doe the Papists vse to crie out this day, the King drinketh, when their king of beanes drinketh. The Roman Martyrologe, and Vsuardus doe consecrate this day to Saint Macra of Rhemes, to Melanius of Rhedon, and Nilammon in Ægypt. Molanus telleth vs very soberly the names of the three kings of Collein, and how Raymundus generall of the Dominicans is honored at Barcelona, albeit he were neuer canonized. Out of which we gather plaine arguments, first of the diuision and discord of Papists about the worship of Saints. Nert of the foolishnesse of Popery, that is built on such foolish fables. For out of legends the Papists receiue

the names and miracles of the three Kings, and their other actions. Thirdly of the uncerteinty of Romish saints, whose names and actions many times are not knowen. Fourthly of the Popes usurpation in canonizing saints, which is not acknowledged in all places. And lastly of the erroneous courses of Papists, who to the dishonor of Christ loyne the memoriall of his incarnation and miracles with the legends of Macra, Melanius, Nilammon, Raymundus, and such like petit Saints.

IAN. 7. On the seuenth day Parsons doth celebrat the feast of bringing backe the Child Iesus out of Ægypt. The ground of which feast is taken out of an apocryphall booke de infantia Christi, as Petrus de Natal. sheweth lib. 2. c. 51. Upon the same day the Papists in Denmarke celebrated in time past the feast of S. Canutus. But neither doth it appeare, that he professed one faith with Parsons, or that he died for it. Ioan. Magnus hist. Goth. lib. 18. c. 13. saith he was liberall to Priests, and preferred them before his nobility. But that may be performed by any prophane prince. He sheweth also, that he was slaine of the multitude. But so haue also other tyrannicall Princes beene. miserable therefore are the blind Papists, that trust in saints, of whose faith and saluation they haue no assurance. The Roman Martyrologe celebrateth as this day the feast of Lucian a priest, and Clerus a deacon of Antioch, of Cletus, Felix, Ianuarius, Iulian and others. And yet Baronius in his notes hath much adoe to cleare this Lucian of the crime of heresie. Marius Victorinus lib. 1. aduers. Arianos, of this man calleth the Arians, Lucianistes. Baronius doth tell a horrible tale of him, how the Dolphins brought his bodie through the sea to Drepanum in Bithynia. *eius venerandum corpus post martyrium Delphinorum obsequio Drepanum in Bithynia delatum.* Here also he translated Drepanum from Sicily to Bithynie. Upon such tales the worship of saints is grounded. What Felix and Ianuarius and Theodore, and the rest of these saints were, and what faith they professed, the Papists themselues cannot shew. Baronius speaking of Saint Iulian saith, it is not knowen, when and where he suffered.

quando

quando vel vbi passus sit, latet, saith he. Why then doth he propose such fellowes to be worshipped, of whose times and places of sufferings, nay of whose faith and sufferings, he hath no assurance or authenticall witnesse?

IAN. 8. The eight of Ianuary is appointed out by Parsons singly for Lucian a priest. But the Roman Martyrologe ioyneth with him Maximian, Iulian, Eugenian, Theophilus a deacon Helladius, Seuerinus a Bishop, Patiens, Seuerinus an abbat, that preached to the Germans called Norici. Baronius sheweth, that his body was translated out of Germany to a place by Naples. but how he came thither, he is not able to tell vs, nor can he assure vs, that this is his body. His best witnesse is Surius a lying fabler. Of the acts, saith, and sufferings of these Saints they bring scarce any authenticall record. Molanus addeth to the rest S. Gudula his patronesse, a good saint, and great worker of miracles, as he beleeueth. For where she was buried, at Ham, he saith, that a popular spring, in the midst of winter, did presently spring vp, and grow to a great tree that bore leaues. He might also haue added, that bore apples. For all is alike credible. He telleth vs also of Saint Frodobert, Erard, Chozebilt, & other strange, and new saints, graced, as it seemeth, by the Pope, to the disgrace of his followers, that worship they know not whom, nor wherefore. Petrus de Natalibus in catal. lib. 2. c. 55. telleth, how Lucian being beheaded tooke vp his head with his owne hands, and passing through a riuer (he needed not to feare drowning being headlesse) walked three miles, and that 500. gentiles seeing this miracle were conuerted vnto Christ. And this is the cause percase, why Parsons preferreth him before all the rest, hoping himselfe, if neede be, to walke headlesse. Seuerinus the abbat is said to haue driuen the locusts out of all the country, saue out of one mans field, that would not come to church. Whereby it appeareth he neuer came into England. For he driueth not out the Iebusiticall locusts, nor punisheth the recusants, that refuse to come to church.

IAN. 9. The ninth day of Ianuarie is kept holy by Parsons his appointment in honor of Iulian and Basilissa, Martyrs as he calleth

leth them. But Baronius a man of more learning then he, saith Basilissa was no martyr. *licet martyrium non obierit*, saith he. Parsons saith a famous church was built in their honor. Baronius saith, it was built in the name of Iulian only. The same day by the Romish Martyrologe is assigned to Marciana, Marcionilla, Celsus, Antonius, Vitalis and others. Petrus de Natalibus lib. 2. c. 58. telleth how Marciana being deliuered ouer to be abused, a stone wall by Gods appointment did alwaies thrust it selfe betweene her, and those that offered to come nere her. For it is as easy a matter with these good fellowes, to make walles and trees to spring out of the ground, as to plant colewoorts. The Spanish legend telleth, how Iulian and Basilissa being maried together, liued notwithstanding virgins, & many other strange tales. O strange faith of Papists, that is built on such fables! Molanus addeth the names of S. Adrian of Kent, & S. Wanning the founder of the monastery of Fescamp. But for so much, as we find no memoriall of the faith and acts of these saints in authenticall writers, we are to pray Robert Parsons the Popes tinker to peece vp the old ketile Martyrologies, for his credit sake to shew vs some authenticall proofe for Marcionilla and her sonne Celsus and the 7. brethren, and other Romish Saints mentioned this day.

IAN. 10. Nicanor one of the 7. deacons is said to haue suffered the 10. of Ianuarie. But Parsons cannot shew, that he held any article of the Romish religion, oppugned by vs. With him in other martyrologies are ioyned Agatho the Pope, Paul the Heremite, William Bishop of Burges, Domitian Bishop of Malta, and others. But the ground of their worship is layd vpon legends, and those not very probable. In Paul the Hermits legend we find, that Antonie wandring in the desert met with Hippocentaures and Satyrs, that were halfe men, halfe beasts. It may be many such are at Rome kept in the Popes store. But we simple Christians are hardly induced to beleeue such fables. It is said also, that a wolfe very gently conducted Antony to Paul. sure he was of a more gentle race, then the Romish wolues.

The

The 11. day is appointed to Hyginius the Pope by Parsons, who aboue all saints worshippeth Popes, if by any mishap he might be made Cardinall by them. In Affrike Saloius is remembred, and at Alexandria Petrus, Seuerus and Leucius. Molanus placeth vpon this day, the death of Iaspar, one of the three Kings of Colein, as they are called. Others adde Anastasius, and Palemon two old Monkes. But neither shall Parsons be able to proue his faith by the doctrine of Hyginius, though much flattered by him, nor by any of the rest. Nor shall Baronius be able to iustifie the lying legends, though he sweat like a man washed in sope. We may rather thereof gather the distraction of Papists in their worship of Saints, and the weakenesse of their faith grounded vpon such rotten legendes.

Of Tatiana we reade this 12. of Ianuary. But nothing for Parsons his aduantage. For she with her praiers ouerthrew grauen Images, he with his prating would gladly bring them into the churches of Christians. The Greeke menologe doth here record other Saints. The Spanish calendar speaketh of my Lord abbot Victorinus. The Roman Martyrologe recordeth Satyrus, Arcadius, Zoticus, Rogatus, Modestus and others: but which is to be well obserued, all remembred as Saints without any canonization of any Bishop of Rome, furthermore not one of them speaketh one word for those articles of Popery, which the Church of England refuseth. Onely forty two superstitious Monkes are here remembred, that died for defence of the worship of images, as is sayd. But yet canne it not be proued, that they allowed the images of the Trinity, or diuine worship giuen to the crosse, or graue Images. For they were Greekes, and not the Popes followers. Beside that, if they died for dumbe Images, then haue they no portion with ancient Martyrs, that died for Christ Iesus.

This 13. day is by the Romanists assigned for the solemnization of 40. soldiers Martyred, as is said, vnder Galienus; yet none worshipped by any warrant from any Romish Bishop. Further Baronius denieth, that Gallienus raised any persecu-

tion. This we beleeue, that none of them, although soldiers, thought himselfe by the Popes commaund warranted to fight against the Emperor. Parsons he cannot tell any of their names. Gladly then would we know, how he prayeth vnto them, and by what titles. Vnto this number others adde Potitus, Hermylus, Stratonicus, Gumesindus, Seruidius, and Kentigernus. This last, as is said, restored a Robin red-brest to life, which his fellowes had killed. A worthy peece of seruice. He made also a greene peece of a hazell sticke to burne with fire, that came downe from heauen, if Iohn Capgraue saie true.

Hilary of Poitiers was a worthy Bishop, and vnlike to the Popes mitred creatures, whether we respect his life, or doctrine. For he preached nothing but the doctrine of the Prophets, and Apostles, and as Petr. de Natal. lib. 3. catal. c. 68. doth testifie, had a wife and a daughter called Aphra. Parsons therefore had no reason to celebrate his festiuity, being so opposite vnto him. Neither should he haue placed him vpon the 14 of Ianuary, if he had regarded the Popes law, or old english calendars, that assigne to him the 13. of Ianuary. On this day the Greckes solemnize the memory of diuers Monkes, whose names they know not. The Roman Martyrologe mentioneth S. Felix of Nola, Malachy the Prophet, Datius a Bishop of Milan, Euphrasius, Pontianus, and certaine Monkes slaine on the top of the mount Sina by the Saracens. But neither can Parsons proue any point of his moderne Romish faith denied by vs out of their testimonies, nor is he able to shew, what they were, or that they acknowledged the Popes omnipotent power. Neither is it materiall that we finde Monkes here mentioned. For they were none of the Popes creatures, nor of the qualities of moderne Monkes.

The Romish Martyrologe giueth Paul the hermit the 10. day. Parsons contrary to it, and to the English calendar assigneth him the 15. day of Ianuary, and with him he yoketh Maurus the Monke, albeit in place and forme of Monkery farre differing from Paulus. And yet I doe not thinke, that he

he beléeueth all the reports made of Maurus in the legends. It is said, that he walked vpon the water, rayſed the dead, & ſaw Benedictus his ſoule in the Eaſt mounting vp to heauen. The Martyrologe of Rome addeth Abachuc, Micheas, Secundina, Epheſius, Maximus, Iſidorus, Ioannes Calybita and Malbodius. But little doe the ancient Prophets make for the moderne Romiſh religion. On the other ſide we ſée great vncertainty in ſaints, falſe miracles pretended for the eſtabliſhment of their worſhip, diſſention in the authors of Martyrologies. Molanus on this day placeth the celebration of the ſweet name of Ieſus. But Chriſt deſerued better at his hands, then to be placed, either with Monks, or after Monkes. Such honor in true accompt is diſhonor.

Vpon the 16. of Ianuary, by the reckoning of Parſons we haue the memory of Marcellus biſhop of Rome. But no ſigne or ſuſpition do we find in him of a triple crowne, croſſed ſlipper, or a guard of Suizzers about him. Neither doth it appeare, that he was carried vpon mens ſhoulders, or taught the decretaline doctrine of Popes. The Romane Martyrologe addeth biſhop Honoratus, but without mitre, croſſe ſtaffe, or ſandales. The ſame mentioneth alſo S. Titian and Mela, Friar Berard and other minorites martyred at Marocco, but not for teaching the Popes ſupremacy, or the carnall reall preſence, but for preaching Chriſt, and condemning Mahomets Alchoran. S. Furſe alſo a confeſſour is this day remembred. But his confeſſion maketh little for Parſons his anaile. For as Capgraue in his legend telleth, he accuſeth Maſſe-prieſts of incontinency. *carnis incontinentia*, ſaith he, *ſunt lubrici*. He condemneth thoſe alſo, that abſtained from certaine meates. The reſt Parſons will not warrant to be true, leſt S. Quintin take him by the noſe, as a falſary. For as we read in his legend, hee made the noſe of a falſe fellow fall off, whom he called falſary. *Apprehendens naſum*, ſaith the legend, *falſarium vocauit*. And preſently the falſary was left without noſe.

The 17. day is dedicated to S. Anthony by Parſons, and that percaſe becauſe hée had care of his mother goodwife

Cowbuckes pigges. Others adde three brethren all borne at one birth and martyred together. Surius saith, they suffered vnder Aurelianus the Emperour in the time of Polycarpus. But these two liued not together at one time, and Baronius acknowledgeth, that there is no coherence betwixt them. The Roman martyrologe this day celebrateth the inuention of the bodies of Diodorus and Marianus, and others choked in a caue, where men vsed to digge for sand. But who is able to say, that the bodies found some fiue or sixe hundred yeares after were their true bodies? The best witnesse they haue to proue this, is Surius, a witnesse, whose depositions and testifications are not to be valued at a sous. Molanus addeth S. Genulphus bishop of Cahors. But who knoweth him to be a Saint? Further he is a man of light credit, that beleeueth, that diuels appearing to S. Anthony in the formes of beasts, did teare him with their hornes and nailes; and whatsoeuer else is reported in his fabulous legend. For God suffereth not his Saints to be torne by diuels. Finally it cannot be proued, that S. Anthony euer heard of the decretales of Popes, or the whole doctrine of the Romanists. But contrariwise S. Augustine in præfat. de doctr. Christ. testifieth, that although he could not read; yet by continuall hearing the scriptures he did remember them, and vnderstand them, and by meditation kept them. *Sine vlla scientia literarum scripturas diuinas & memoriter audiendo intellexisse, & prudenter cogitando tenuisse prædicatur.* An euident demonstration against the Papists, that condemne the reading of Scriptures, and their idle Monkes, that are ignorant of Scriptures, and spend their whole time in pattring ouer their canonicall houres, as they call them, without any meditation of scriptures in tongues vnderstood.

Now are we come to S. Peters chaire, a solemne and rubricated Saint, solemnized the 18. of Ianuary, and more esteemed by Parsons, and his fellowes, whose errors flowe from the Popes chaire or close stole, then any thing els, saue a Cardinals hat. But Optatus and other fathers speaking of S. Peters chaire meane not any wooden, or materiall chaire, but

but the forme of doctrine, which S. Peter taught. From which the Romanists departing are very absurd fellowes, to vant of his materiall chaire. This feast was abolished in most places saith Baronius, vntill Paul the 4. restored it. Parsons for supply of the chaire addeth the memory of Prisca a Virgin, and Martyr, as he saith. But what maner of Martyr she should be, there is no small question, as appeareth by Baronius his annotations. Some hold, that she suffered vnder the first Claudius, some vnder the second. Her acts make the same most ambiguous. Petrus de Natal. in Catal. lib. 2. c. 96. saith, that at her prayers the earth shooke, and a fourth part of Apolloes temple fell, and killed many Pagans. He maketh also the diuell to speake out of the aire, and to confesse of himselfe and his fellowes. The Roman Martyrologe addeth Moseus and Ammonius, Athenogenes, Volusianus, Leobardus, and my lord Abbat Deicola, the disciple of Columbanus, and Saint Liberata. But the witnesses that speake of these Saints, are so suspitious, and their reports so diuers, that it seemeth an absurd thing to credit such things, and a hard thing to discerne what is truth. Onely in one thing the Papists may vaunt, that they haue one Monke that was Deicola, the rest are Sanctícolæ and Angelicolæ.

Vpon Wolstan, Parsons bestoweth the 19. of Ianuary, and a scarlet gowne. Yet was the same neuer made redde with martyrdome, but with painters colours. His legend set downe by Capgraue is so full of fables, that it is to be wondred, that when he braggeth of this Saint, he blusheth not, and hath not a face as red as scarlet. The legend testifieth, that he was vnlearned, which is a simple commendation for a bishop. It is said also, that he wrastled with the Diuell, and gaue him three fals. But in the Gospell we read, that the Diuell is compared to a strong man, and to strong for such a weake fellow to deale withall. For his insufficiency he should haue bẽ deposed, but that as is contained in the legend, resigning his staffe it stucke fast in King Edwards marble tombe. A marble face he had, that first deuised this

absurd

absurd fable. Finally it is said of him, that he put eies into a mans head, that wanted eies, and so made him see. Did he create eies trow you, or did he put sheeps eies, or some other mans eies into his head? The matter is very hard to be assoiled. The Romish martyrologe now also celebrateth the memory of Marius and Martha, Audifax and Abbachum, Germanicus, Paulus, Pontianus, Basilianus, and diuers others. Molanus addeth Launomarus and Contextus, whose legends are patched together by lying companions. And yet hardly shall Parsons proue any point of his false Romish faith by vs called into controuersie, by the testimony of any of these Martyrs.

Upon the 20. of Ianuary Fabian and Sebastian are set downe in red. oh great pity it is, that no Pope will set vp Robert Parsons in red, that without blushing red telleth so many lyes for his seruice! that Fabian the Bishop of Rome did worship saints, or teach Romish decretales, he shall neuer proue. Petrus de Natalibus lib. 2. c. 106. telleth how Sebastian was shot so full of arrowes, that he looked like a porkepine. Nay being shot so many times through the bodie, he saith he died not for all that. The Romish Martyrologe, and Vsuardus mention other saints vpon this day. But that which they say of Saint Sebastian is more then can be beleeued. For at that time the Romans were no such archers. Neither did they shoot any through the heart, but they killed him downe right.

Agnes a yong mayden of thirteene yeares of age was to yong to vnderstand either the schole subtilties, or the Popes prerogatiues, and therefore foolishly is she calendred the 21. of Ianuary for a Romish Martyr. In their legendes the Papists tell wonders, how she was beloued of Symphronius his sonne, and how she was caried to the bordell, and had familiarity with Angels, and being committed to the fire could not be burned. The fathers speake of a Martyr so called, but say nothing of these miracles. Molanus saith her body is worshipped at Vtrecht. It behoueth some friend of his therefore to shew, that her body is there, and how it came

came thither. In Spaine the Papists worship Fructuosus, Augurius and Eulogius. Parsons therefore omitting the memory of them deserueth euill his pension of the king of Spaine, or to be termed his Confessor.

In the celebrity of Vincentius and Anastasius vpon the 22. of Ianuary, Parsons seemeth somewhat too sparing in giuing them honor. For Vincentius in the Calendar of Sarum is put in red letters, though he put him there onely in bare blacke. And Anastasius is said to haue learned Christianity of a smith, a man of Parsons putatiue fathers occupation. Now the Papists shew the body of Anastasius at Venice, and of Vincentius in Spaine, after that the same came swimming to the shore with a millstone about his necke. But wheresoeuer they shew their bodies, their confessions make nothing for the Popes supremacy or other Popish opinions. The Romish martyrologe and Vsuardus at this day mention other saints. But of their faith and acts, albeit Baronius haue taken great paines to search all corners, no authentical proofe can be brought.

This 23. day by Parsons is assigned to Emerentiana onely. Others ioine with her Parmenas, Seuerianus and his wife Aquila, Iohn the Almoner, Ascla, and others. But none of them were Canibals and eaters of mans flesh, or worshipped the Pope, as a God of the earth, or in any point fauoured of Popery.

Timotheus, mentioned this day in the calendar, thought, that the scriptures were able to make the man of God perfect, and taught no other doctrine than that, which he had learned of the Apostle. Further he reputed them heretickes, that forbade marriage, or commanded abstinence from certaine meats. Finally he praied for Princes. For so he was taught by the Apostle S. Paul his master. We may not thinke therefore, that he was a fauourer of the Popes doctrine, that alloweth the cutting of Princes throats, and curseth them, and teacheth doctrine quite contrary to that, which Timothy learned. Vpon this day the Roman martyrologe mentioneth also Babylas, and other Saints: but all of them fauourers of truth,

truth, and enemies of Popery. Where Babylas, was entombed, there the Diuell was silent. But among Papists nothing is more common, then possession of Christians by Diuels, and oracles of Diuels, and proues drawen from the testimony of Diuels. They seeke also to blow vp states with Gunpowder, and to stirre vp rebellions.

Paul the Apostle was conuerted to Christ, and for the name of Christ he suffered Martyrdome. What his faith and doctrine was, his holy epistles doe testifie. If then Parsons ment only to celebrate the feasts of such, as professed the faith of the moderne church of Rome, he had no reason to appoint the 25. day to this holy Apostle, whose doctrine is so diuers and contrary to schole Diuinity, and Popish decretales. The Romish Martyrologe together with Saint Paul ioyneth Proiectus and Marinus, Ananias, Iuuentinus and Maximus, Donatus, Sabinus, Agapis, and Bretannio. But none of these Saints either taught, or beleeued any doctrine, but that which was consonant to the preaching of the Apostle Saint Paul. Which being so much differing from the doctrine of Aquinas, and Scotus, and their fellowes, it seemeth strange to me, that Parsons durst place them among his saints. Theodoret lib. hist. 3. c. 14. as is said, sheweth how Iuuentinus and Maximus were buried, and honoured with a festiuall day. But now the Papists digge vp the bones of their Saints out of their graues, and place them vpon their altars, and call vpon them in their Masses, and publike offices; things neuer vsed in ancient tyme. Molanus for Proiectus and Marinus hath Preiectus and Amarinus. He addeth also Poppo and Henricus Suso. But these saints in other places, saue the Low-countries, seeme little to haue beene regarded. There is no reason, certes, why they should be matched with the Apostle S. Paul.

What saints are not to be worshiped in that forme, which the Papists practise, the history of Polycarpus, whose memoriall they celebrate the 26. of Ianuary doth testifie. For as Eusebius lib. 4. c. 14. writeth, the Christians affirmed, that they could not worship any, but Christ. Which Polycarpus

pus the Romanists do ioine Theogenes, and 36. more, slain in the persecution of Valerianus the Emperor, whose names they know not. They adde also S. Paula, worshipped at Bethlehem, and Bathildis King Clodoueyes wife. Molanus this day celebrateth the feast of S. Marus bishop of Treues, and of the holy father Xenophon. But neuer did Polycarpus teach the moderne Romish faith, nor are the Papists certaine, what faith Bathildis, Marus and Xenophon professed. Are not the Papists then like to the Iewes, that adorned the tombes of the Prophets: For as the Iewish traditions differed much from the doctrine of the Prophets, so doth the doctrine of Popes, Monkes and Friers differ infinitely from the doctrine of the ancient Martyrs of Christ Iesus.

That excellent Doctor Iohn Chrysostome, whose memory is celebrated the 27. of Ianuary, did neither acknowledge the bishop of Rome to be head, or monarch, or spouse of the vniuersall Church, nor was he any worshipper of images or crosses. Parsons therefore may do well to blot this holy Doctor out of his Calendar, whose doctrine being allowed, the Papists must needs blot their decretales, breuiaries, and missals. The Romish Martyrologe therefore this day celebrateth the memory of Maurus or Marius an Abbat, and a man more fit for their humour. The same also ioineth with others, Iulian, Vincentius, and 27. Martyrs, beside Datius, Vitalianus, and others, all of them omitted by Parsons. IAN. 27.

Vpon the 28. day S. Cyril bishop of Alexandria is mentioned. But Parsons hath no reason to speake of him more then of Chrysostome, both of them being diligent teachers, and building their doctrine, not vpon the Popes decretales or vnwritten traditions, but vpon the writings of the Prophets and Apostles. It seemeth therefore that Parsons would vpon euery day let vs vnderstand, how much he forgetteth himselfe and his cause. The English Calendar doth againe vpon this day remember S. Agnes. The Roman Martyrologe addeth the memory of Leucius, Thyrsus and Callinicus, of Leonides and his companions, and diuers others. But he although a great worshipper of saints, yet forgat all these IAN. 28.

Saints

Saints. Percase he was not able to shew what they were. It is also hard to beleeue, that Leucius being to suffer martyrdome, was called by a voice from heauen. Molanus would haue Charles the great, and S. Margaret a Nunne, to haue part also of this solemnity. But the Emperour was neuercanonized, and that percase because he was no fauorer of the worship of images. And the Nunne cannot be proued either Martyr or Confessor, albeit Garinus saith what he can to the contrary. Heere also he talketh of twenty thousand Martyrs, and nameth not one of them.

IAN. 29. In the Roman martyrologe vpon the 29. of Ianuary, Sulpitius Seuerus is the last that is remembred. It may therefore be a question, how it commeth to passe, that he is the only man named this day by Parsons: and the rather, for that * Gennadius doth testifie, that he was a Pelagian. The Romish Martyrologe putteth Papias and Maurus, Constantius, Sarbelius and Barbea and others before him. Molanus addeth Gildas. But neither are the Papists able to proue these Saints to haue beene canonized, nor to demonstrate plainly, what faith they professed. Baronius in not. ad Martyr. saith the bodies of Maurus and Papias are in Rome. But Petrus de natalib. lib. 3. c. 40. saith they are in Nympha, a place somewhat distant from Rome. So it appeareth they worship vncertaine Saints, and vncertaine Saints bones.

* *De vir. illuſt. c. 19.*

IAN. 30. Hippolytus a Priest of Antioch is calendred by Parsons on the 30. day for a Martyr. But of any Hippolytus, that was drawen in peeces at the taile of a chariot drawen with wild horses, beside the sonne of Theseus we reade not in any authenticall history. Baronius telleth vs of three Martyrs of this name. But he bringeth no authenticall proofe for them. Prudentius Peristeph. hym. 11. mentioneth but one. The Roman Martyrologe and Vsuardus do testifie, that he was a Nouatian hereticke. Parsons saith, that at his death he professed, how that faith only was to be held, which the chaire of Peter did defend. But of this fable he bringeth no proofe. The Romish Martyrologe testifieth, that he spoke only of the doctrine of the Bishop of Rome at that time taught against

gainſt the hereſie of Nouatus. The ſame alſo addeth Barſimeus, Barſes and other ſaints, to ſhew how much the Romaniſts diſagree about ſaints. Molanus telleth, how ſaint Aldegonde was confirmed in the vow of virginity by angelicall reuelations. But they ſeeme to be rather either diabolicall illuſions, or monkiſh deceits and impoſtures.

The laſt day of Ianuary Parſons doth dedicate to Saint Metran put to death at Alexandria for refuſing to vtter blaſphemous words againſt Chriſt. But firſt Parſons miſnameth his Saint being rightly called Metra by Euſebius lib. 6. eccleſ. hiſt. c. 34. Next he ſheweth his owne conſorts to be contrary to ancient Martyrs. For they teaching that Chriſts body may be eaten of dogges and hogges doe vtter blaſphemous words againſt Chriſt; the which holy Martyrs would not doe, albeit they died for it. The Roman Martyrologe as this day celebrateth the feaſt of Cyrus and Iohn, Saturninus, Thyrſus, and Victor, Tharſicius, Zoticus, Cyriacus and others. The Venetians this day doe celebrate the tranſlation of Saint Markes body from Alexandria to Venice. But the reportes of this tranſlation are ſo vncertaine, and the legends ſo vaine and fabulous, that heere we may take iuſt occaſion to lament the miſerable blindneſſe of Papiſts, that leauing the true and euerliuing God, doe worſhip vncertaine ſaints, and reliques of ſaints, nay oft times for the reliques of ſaints, doe adore the bodies and reliques of Pagans, Heretikes, and wicked men. Further leauing holy ſcriptures, they beleeue lying legendes. IAN. 31.

CHAP. II.

Of the faith and acts of Romiſh *Saints calendred in the moneth of* February.

The Maſſe-prieſts of England in time paſt were wont vpon the firſt of February to celebrate the feaſt of Saint Brigit. But Parſons for malice, as it may be preſumed, to this virgin, that prophecied againſt the Pope, as a killer of ſoules FEB. 1.

soules, and against his seat, which she said should be throwen into the depth, and sinke like a stone, omitteth her name. Molanus writeth, that when she touched an altar in testimony of her virginity, the drie wood of the same became greene. Which if Parsons should doe in like case, the same would hardly come to passe, as the secular Masse-priests beleeue. The saint, which best pleased him to grace, is Ignatius, whose name the first founder of the Iebusites did take vpon him. Yet did not Ignatius beleeue the Popes generall monarchy ouer the church, or know the moderne doctrine of the Ignatians. Further, Chrysostome in homil. de translat. corp. Ignat. and Felix in epist. ad Zenonem. in synodo 5. act. 1. and Theodoret dial. 1. affirme, that Ignatius was the second Bishop of Antioch, and not the third, as Parsons affirmeth. The Roman Martyrologe this day celebrateth the feast of Pionius, Seuerus, Ephrem, and Paulus. Molanus saith that Seuerus frō a weauer or woll-worker was taken to be Bishop of Rauenna. *Deus de lanificio arte ad episcopatū sustulit.* His body is this day shewed, as they say, in our ladies church at Roan. But how the same came thither, may be no small question. At Vasli they honour Saint Precordius a confessor, at Poitiers Saint Leonius, at Ausburg Saint Vrsus, at Mets King Sigebert a confessor. But how the holinesse, and saith of these Saints may be iustified, we finde little.

FEB. 2. In time past the Pagans about this time did celebrat their Lupercalia, wherein like mad men they ran vp and downe naked. Likewise they celebrated the feast of Proserpina, whom Ceres sought with candels. In liew of which feasts this solemnity of Candlemas hath succeeded. *Opinamur*, saith Baronius, *abrogatis lupercalibus Roma eiusmodi solennitatem fuisse introductam.* Iames de Voragine saith, that Sergius ordeined, that in honour of our Lady Christians should light the world with candles, because they would not easily leaue old customes. Vpon this day the Romanists do celebrate the feast of Cornelius, Apronianus, Fortunatus, Felicianus, Firmus, Candidus, Flosculus and Laurentius. But none of these

these doe witnesse any point of Popery in controuersie betwixt the Papists and vs. Cornelius was reproued, when he went about to worship Saint Peter. Apronianus is said to heare these words from heauen, come ye blessed of may father, and possesse the kingdome that is prepared for you &c. So likewise doe they report strange things of the rest. Molanus vpon this day mentioneth Saint Sicharia, and one Godermunde worshipped in Iseland. But God knoweth, what saints they were.

Blasius as we reade in the 38. legend of Iames de Vorag. Was fedde by birdes, that brought him meat to the hole, where he was hidden. It is said also, that the birds, that came so vnto him would not depart vntill such time, as he had laid his hands vpon them, and blessed them; and that the beasts, that were pursued by the hunters came to him for succor, and could not there be taken. Further the same man reporteth, that he commanded a wolfe to restore a pig, that was taken from a poore widow, and that the same was performed accordingly. But whether he restored the pigge before he had eaten him, or afterward, it is not expressed. For the working of these miracles Blasius hath procured himselfe great worship, and the rather, for that he hath a faculty to cure sore throtes. In Afrike they celebrate this day the memorie of Celerinus, Celerina, Laurentinus, and Ignatius. But neuer a one of these beleeued on the Pope, or knew the moderne Popish decretales. Molanus addeth Saint Waldetrudis, Saint Hadelmus, Saint Anatholius, Saint Berlendis, Saint Oliueria and Liberata and such like new found saints. But neither is there any authenticall testimony found of their faith and holy manners, nor haue we any reason to beleeue their lying legendes. FEB. 3.

The 4. day of February is assigned by Parsons to Eutychius alone, although this saint be not once mentioned in the old English calendar. May which is a worse point, it is not knowen, either what he was, or what faith he professed. Only there is an epitaph grauen on his tombe, and written, as they say, by Damasus. But it is not likely, that Dama- FEB. 4.

sus would say, that the Martyr washed away his sinnes with his owne blood, or that he was able to giue all things to those that should pray vnto him, as is said in that Epitaph reported by Baronius. May albeit Parsons calleth vpon him; yet can he not obteine as yet a cardinals hat of him. Vsuardus doth not so much as mention this saint. The Roman Martyrologe addeth Aquilus, Geminus, Gelasius, Phileas, Philoromus, Gilbertus and diuers others. Molanus addeth Saint Lietphard, and Saint Rembert, and Saint Vulgisus. But what manner of men these were, and what these saints are able to doe, neither can Baronius, nor any other assure vs. Molanus saith Saint Gilbert founded the monasterie of Sempingham, Baronius saith he founded the abbey of Gemblaca our writers calleth it Sempringham; which being ruined the abominations of the nunnes appeared.

FEB. 5. Agatha suffered vnder Decius, as they say. Yet no ancient writer of that time doth mention any such martyr. The best author is Metaphrastes, and with him are ioyned other writers of legends. The narration of this saint conteineth many ferly things. Saint Peter, as is said, came to her in prison with a boy bearing a lanterne before him. For otherwise percase he could not well see to speake to her in the dark. The same author reporteth, how Christ healed her wounds, and how a wall fell on two of Quintianus his counsellors, and how the Iudge himselfe was killed by his owne horses, and how in the end she prayed, and died of her owne accord. Gregory the first lib. 3. epist. 19. mentioneth a church of Agatha in Suburra, which had beene a denne for heretikes. But whether the church was dedicated to Saint Agatha of Catana or not, Parsons cannot tell. Baronius telleth vs of many Saints, that suffered as this day in Pontus. But their names he knoweth not. Molanus addeth Berturfus, Vodalus and Aleis. But miserable are they, that hope for helpe at their hands, of whose holinesse we haue so small euidence.

FEB. 6. The 6. day is consecrated by Parsons to Dorothea. So farre is she in his fauour, albeit she is not once mentioned in the old calendar of Sarum. With her also is ioyned Theophilus,

ophilus, to whom as Petrus de Natal. lib. 3. c. 101. saith, she sent three roses, and three apples out of paradise. I doe not heare that Campian sent any such tokens out of paradise to Robert Parsons. Other calendars make mention of Vedastus, who commanded a wolfe to depart out of his residence, & Amandus, that vp the signe of the crosse drane a great serpent into his denne, and there confined him. He that beleeueth these foleries, deserueth also himselfe to be confined with theeues in Newgate. Molanus addeth two virgins called Harlindis and Relindis: two strange names, but more strange saints.

Diuers times Parsons hath shewed himselfe vnkind to English saints. But here he maketh an amends worshipping Saint Richard king of England on this day. But one great mischiefe he had need to beware of. viz. that he worship not a fiction for a Saint, which hardly he will be able to auoid in this king saint. For neither doe our English calendars, nor Chronicles mention any King Richard, that was neuew to king Offa, and liued in the daies of Zachary the Pope, and was father to Willibald, Winibald, and Waldeburga, as this bald lebusite reporteth. The Roman Martyrologe before this king preferreth Augulus a Bishop of Britaine, Adaucus Martyred in Phrygia, with a whole city of Martyrs, Theodorus of Heraclea and others. But Baronius cannot tell, when Adaucus suffered. the rest also are obscure, and the causes of their sufferings more obscure. Doth he not then deserue to faile of his request, that praieth to such, as either were neuer in the world, or else neuer knowen? this day by Molanus is consecrated to Helene the mother of Constantine; which if Parsons had loued his country, he would not haue forgotten. FEB. 7.

Of all the saints, whose memories were celebrated in time past vpon the 8. of Februarie Parsons nameth only one Cointha, that is the meanest of all, and seemeth to haue beene worshipped only at Alexandria. He omitteth Paulus, Lucius and Cyriacus, whose festiuall daies are kept at Rome, and Dionysius, Emilianus and Sebastian honored, as they say, in FEB. 8.

Armenis, and of Salomon worshipped at Cordova in Spaine. But it may be, as Baronius saith of Paulus, Lucius, and Cyriacus, that the times of their sufferings are vncertaine. it may be also, that they did no such acts, as are reported. Finally it may be there neuer were any such Martyrs, as are oft times mentioned in the calendars. This we may assure our selues, that they that lined in the times of persecutions before Constantine the great were all strangers to the moderne Romish faith. The English calendar acknowledgeth no such saint, as this Cointha.

Feb. 9. Apollonia had her teth drawen out, and therefore the Papists worship her, as hauing a faculty to cure the tothach. But Eusebius lib. 6. hist. c. 34. where he relateth the story of her Martyrdome, doth neither shew, that she was worshipped, nor signifieth, that she had any power to cure the toth-ach. May Dionysius reporteth, that she was *admodũ prouectæ ætate*. It is not like therefore that being very old, she had many teth in her head to lose: which sheweth the falshod of Romish reliques, among which are whole bushels full of Apollonaes teth. At Rome beside this old mayden they doe worship vpon the 9. of February Alexander and 38. crowned men. It is wonderous therefore that Parsons louing crownes so well, should forget these crowned saints. Molanus addeth Blandinius, and the son of Saint Hugh king of England. We would therefore pray Parsons to aske his holy father, what manner of man this king Hugh was, and what his sonne was called. For if he tell vs not, then all the world may see, that his followers worship saints, that neuer were in the world. Neither the English calendar, nor our histories would haue passed ouer so famous a king, and renowned a saint, if any such had beene in the world.

Feb. 10. Of Soteris Ambros. lib. 3. de virgin. if that booke were truly made by him, doth make mention. But he neither saith, she suffered at Rome, nor in via Appia, although Parsons affirme both. Vsuardus saith, she suffered in the east. So saith Peter de Natal. in catal. lib. 3. c. 111. the Romish Martyrologes addeth the names of Zoticus, Irenæus, Hiacinthus,

cinthus, and Amantius. But what these saints were, no man can tell. Neither is it certaine, whether there were euer any such Martyrs in the world, or not, vnlesse we will beléeue the Martyrologies, that goe vnder the names of Bede and Vsuardus, which Baronius himselfe would not beléeue in the history of Soteris and diuers others. Molanus addeth Saint William a Frier Heremit of the order of Saint Augustine, as they call it, and Saint Sigon. But neither are these saints to be matched with ancient Martyrs, nor was Augustine a patron of Friars.

Lucius a Bishop, and his fellowes are by Parsons placed vpon the 11. day of February in his calendar. And yet was not Lucius martyred by the Arians, but only died in prison. Further Parsons knoweth not the names of Lucius his fellowes. If then Parsons pray to this saint and his fellowes, saying, O Lucius and your fellowes helpe vs, should he deserue to be holpen? In Afrike this day they celebrate the feast of Saturninus, Datiuus, Felix, Ampelius, and their fellowes. At Lyon in France of Saint Desiderius, and at Rauenna of Calocerus, and of Castrensis at Capua, or as Baronius saith, at Montereall in Sicily. Of which saints it is hard to say, who is to be preferred before his fellowes. Of Castrensis we read, that he is a good saint to mariners, and casteth out diuels, and deliuereth Christians from their wrath. FEB. 11.

Conseruat nautas, & dæmonis eripit iræ
Quem prius obsesso de corpore fecit abire.

Thus the office of Christ is ascribed to an obscure fellow, of whose sanctity we haue iust cause to doubt, and Christ is quite forgotten, while Papists are sent to worship saints.

Eulalia was crucified by the Spaniards at Barcellona. Yet Prudentius Periſt. Hym. 3. saith she was burned at Emerita in Portogall. So now likewise the Spanish inquisitors burne and hang the professors of true religion, wheresoeuer they can take them. The Papists also this day celebrate the memories of Damianus, Modestus, Iulianus, Antonius, Gaudentius, and other saints. Vsuardus addeth the memory of Modestus and Ammonius two infants. But neither do FEB. 12.

the Papists know, what their saints were, nor bring any proofe, that they professed the moderne Romish faith.

Feb. 13. Here Parsons leaueth out the memory of Agabus, of whom mention is made in the Acts of the Apostles, & alligneth the 13. of February to Polieuctus, slaine, as he supposeth, at Melitina in Armenia, of whose faith and holinesse we haue little proofe, vnlesse we beleeue the lying legends. Nay it appeareth not by any authenticall writer, that there is any such city in Armenia as Melitina. Molanus vpon this day setteth downe the name of Ermenilda a virgin of Britaine. Yet in the margent he saith, she was a widow. He addeth Gregory the second, an vnlearned, and an absurd fellow, and Stephen an ermite, and Iordane the master of the Dominicans, and other such like Frierlike saints. But the Popes stampe set vpon their sanctity is not currant. Furthermore no man is able to demonstrate, that they beleeued the moderne Romish faith.

Feb. 14. Valentinus did many miracles, as we find reported in the legends. Yet seeing others did as great miracles as he, why should Parsons single him out, and omit the rest? The Romã Martyrologe saith he was martyred vnder Claudius the Emperor. Yet ecclesiastical histories testifie, that the first persecution against Christians beganne vnder Nero that succeeded Claudius. Vsuardus addeth Vitalis, Felicula and Zeno, Bassus, Antonius, Protolycus, and others. But he proueth not vnto vs, that either there euer were any such men, or that they were saints, and Martyrs. Molanus addeth Saint Auxentius. But if he meane Auxentius of Milan, he was an Arian heretike.

Feb. 15. Faustinus and Iouita called Adrian the Emperour a tortuous adder, and a cruell snake, and told him, that they would not obey his barking. Molanus out of Ado, and Surius maketh them to say these words, *audi Adriane tortuose coluber, imo & sæuissime anguis.* and againe, *latratui tuo non obtemperabimus.* But much it is to be doubted, whether Christian martyrs would haue vsed any such termes to the emperor. The Roman Martyrologe vpõ the 15. of February honoreth Cra-

to

to, Agapis, Castulus, Quinidius, Saint Georgia, and other strange saints. But if Parsons be put to exhibit authenticall proofes for his saints, he will sone be taken halting. The best proofe, that is alledged for S. Georgia the virgin, is Gregory of Tours a sleeping fabler. but the tale of Georgia the virgin is no more to be credited, then the legend of George the dragon killer.

Onesimus was a diligent hearer and follower of Saint Paul the Apostle, and therefore no witnesse for the Popes aduantage. The Roman Martyrologe addeth Saint Iuliana, and saith, that openly she fought a combat with the Diuell. *Palam cum diabolo conflixit.* Petrus de Natal. lib. 3. c. 131. saith, the Diuels name was Belial the sonne of Beelzebub. Lo an excellent herald to set downe the Diuels pedegree. He telleth also, how she bound the Diuels hands behind him, and bet him with a chaine. Molanus this day maketh mention of Saint Symeon of Mets, and of Honestus a Martyr. But what honestly is it to worship such, as either are men vnknowen, or not knowen for saints? FEB. 16.

Iulianus of Cappadocia, saith Parsons, was put to death, for that he had kissed and honored the bodies of Martyrs vnder Diocletian. and for proofe he citeth Eusebius lib. 8. hist. c. 22. But following the steps of Baronius he citeth the 22. chap. for the 21. Besides that he belieth Eusebius. For he saith not, that for kissing Martyrs bodies he was put to death, but sheweth, that for that cause, he was caried before Firmilianus. *exosculans necatorum Martyrum corpora, vt Christianus delatus est.* The Romish Martyrologe sheweth, how he was accused, as a Christian being taken kissing the bodies of the Martyrs, that had beene slaine. Vsuardus addeth Polychronius a Bishop martyred vnder Decius in Persia in the city Babylon. *In Perside*, saith he, *Ciuitate Babylonia &c. præsidente Decio.* Thus we see how by miracle the Papists translate not only mens bodies from place to place, but also Babylon out of Assyria into Persia, and Decius from Rome to Babylon. The Romish Martyrologe remembreth also Saint Finanus a holy Scotish priest, either changing Finanus a Bishop into Fin- FEB. 17.

tanus a priest, by a tricke of Popish transubstantiation, or els forging a new saint to fill vp the old calendar.

Feb. 18. Symeon the Bishop of Hierusalem commeth next in Parsons his calendar. But little doth he make for his popish cause. For in time past holy Bishops preached Christ Iesus, and were Martyred for professing his name. But now the Popes of Rome, albeit they call themselues Bishops, yet preach not Christ, but rather persecute such, as either truely preach, or professe his doctrine. The Roman calendar addeth Flauianus Bishop of Constantinople, and certeine Martyrs, that suffered in Afrike and at Ostia. The Greeke Menologe saith, that Flauianus died in banishment. Baronius saith he was Martyred by the faction of Dioscorus. So well doe the calendars agree one with another. Molanus sheweth how they of Colein kept this 18. day holy in remembrance, that the head of Pantaleon was brought by Henry de Vlmine from Constãtinople, and ioyned to the rest of his bones. But Parsons, if he will maintaine this leasing, must shew good euidence, that this was the head of Pantaleon, which he brought, and that Pantaleons bones were at Coleyn before. Otherwise it will appeare, that for Martyrs the Papists worship they know not what.

Feb. 19. Barbatus Bishop of Beneuentum in Italy is honored vpon the 19. of February by this beardlesse Romish Friar. But of his acts there is no record to be found, but only certaine notes of the lying Monkes of Cassinum. This day at Rome the Papists celebrate the feast of Gabinus brother to bishop Caius. Molanus addeth Saint Auxilius out of Metaphrastes. But if he bring no better witnesse then this Metaphrastes, Ado, and Vsuardus; many of his Saints are in great danger shortly to be cassired out of the calendar. In the meane while we cassier them for being witnesses for Parsons, seeing they speake nothing for his cause.

Feb. 20. Eucherius Bishop of Orleans is set down by Parsons the 20. of February for a Cõfessor, because he was troubled by Charles Martell. But because it appeareth not, that he was troubled by him for matters of faith, he might haue done well, to haue

haue made him giue place to Tyrannio, Siluanus and innumerable Martyrs slaine, as is said, by Veturius vnder Diocletian. *numerum eorum* saith the Romish Martyrologe, *solius dei scientia colligit.* It should seeme, that this tyrant did make such a Massacre of Christians in Phœnicia, as the Popish agents made in France an. 1572. and as the Papists meant to make in England this Parliament, especially if the multitude of them were innumerable, as Peter de Natalib. lib. 3. c. 137. affirmeth.

Seuerianus was slaine by Theodosius an Eutychian Monk, as Nicephorus lib. 15. c. 9. testifieth. So hereticall Friars and Monkes now incite their followers to kill honest and pious Christians. Of the moderne Romish faith this Seuerianus had no taste. In Sicilia the Romanists celebrate the feast of 79. Martyrs, whose names and qualities they know not, to let vs vnderstand that they worship they know not whom. Surius addeth the memory of Pipin, that deposed his master, and liued most lasely. So it appeareth, that the Romish calendar is now made nothing else, but an inuentary of the benefactors of Popes, Monkes, and Friars for the most part, especially if we respect late saints. FEB. 21.

Upon the 22. of February Parsons placeth a venerable and rubricated saint called Saint Peters chaire at Antioch. O simple calendarmonger, that saith ô Saint Peters chaire help vs! and if he say not so, why is the chaire of Peter placed here? May why doe the papists celebrate this feast now, seeing they know, there is now no chaire of Saint Peter at Antioch? doe they not see, that the Turkes doe now sit at Antioch? we also know, that the Turkes are as true successors of Saint Peter at Antioch, as the Pope is at Rome. For proofe of this chaire he alledgeth Eusebius his Chronicle. But neither doth he signifie that Saint Peters chaire is to be worshipped, and placed among Martyrs, nor if we beleeue him, did Peter sit lesse number of yeares at Antioch, then at Rome. The Romish Martyrologe doth honor Papias for a saint, that, as Eusebius lib. 3. eccles. hist. c. 33. relateth, held the heresie of the Millenarians. Molanus addeth the memory of the translation of the bo- FEB. 22.

die

die of S. Gudwall. All which are arguments of the vanity and superstition of the Romish synagogue worshipping all things that come to hand, and sometime she knoweth not whom, nor what.

Feb. 23. On this day Parsons celebrateth the vigill of the Apostle Matthias. He might as well haue recorded, sol in pisces noted in the calendar among the number of his saints, seeing the great difference that is betwixt the vigill, and the saint. At Tudertum in Italy the countrie people solemnize the memory of S. Romana, who as they say was baptized by S. Siluester, and did lead a celestiall life in caues and dennes. But that manner of life seemeth rather brutish and serpentine, then Christian and celestiall. Furthermore all the credit of this tale dependeth vpon the lezendes of the lying Masse-priests of that place.

Feb. 24. Matthias was an holy Apostle, and therefore no witnesse for the Popes decretaline doctrine, that is not Apostolicall. The Greekes contrary to the order of the church of Rome doe celebrate his memory the 9. of August, as Baronius confesseth, which sheweth plainly, that the Greeke Church was not in time past subiect to the Pope. The Romish calendar doth this day mention King Ethelbert, to whom Austen the Monke preached Christian religion. But all the cause of his sanctity was the fauour shewed by him to the Romanists, and the murder of the innocent Monkes of Bangor. For such matters are causes sufficient to make saints among the Papists.

Feb. 25. Cesarius brother to Gregory Nazianzen was in his time a holy man, and no way guilty of any Popish heresie. But that Gregory did see him in glory after his death, as Parsons reporteth out of the lying Romish Martyrologe, is a matter falsely forged. the Roman Martyrologe here mentioneth Felix the Pope, who appearing to Tharsilla his neece called her to the heauenly kingdome, as is said. But herein the misery of Papists is plainly discouered, that suffer themselues to be gulled with such fables. For what marke, I pray you, hath a Popes soule, that it can be discerned from another

another mans soule? Againe, how will it be proued, that soules are at such leasure, that they may come from Heauen to the earth, and of such power, that they may call others to Heauen? Molanus addeth Saint Adeltrude the daughter of Waldetrude, a holy Nunne, as he thought, but whether a holy virgin or no, God knoweth. Much certes was her life and faith different not only from that of Cesarius, but also from the faith and life of the Nunnes of these times.

Alexander Bishop of Alexandria, as he was an enemy of Arius, so was he no teacher of the new decretaline and scholasticall diuinity. He might therefore well haue bene spared by Parsons, and not registred on the 26. of February, holding that faith, that we professe, and not those heresies, superstitions and superfluous opinions, which the Popes factors would willingly thrust vpon vs. The Romish Martyrologe doth this day mention Nestor a Bishop, Papias and his followers, Fortunatus and Felix, Faustinian and Porphyrius. But the same giueth vs no assurance either of their faith, or of their holinesse of life. Onely the legends report of them strange wonders. O miserable creatures, that beleeue such fabulous traditions! FEB. 26.

Leander Bishop of Siuill taught Christian religion, and holpe to conuert the Gothes, not to Popery, but to the true faith. Why then is he calendred on the 27. day as a Romish saint? Metaphrastes speaketh of Andronicus, and Athanasia this day: Vsuardus of S. Baldemer; the Romish Martyrologe of Alexander, Abundius, Antigonus and Fortunatus; Molanus of Honorina worshipped in Normandy; and Procopius honored, we know not where. So that rightly we may say of Papists, as the Prophet Hieremy said of the Iewes: According to the number of their cities, so are their Gods. For how can they say, they make not their saints Gods, when they giue them a great part of Gods diuine honor and power? FEB. 27.

Parsons his last saint for this moneth, is S. Roman, an hermite, as he saith, in the hilles of Burgundy, but in what hilles he knoweth not. Neither doth he make proofe, that either he FEB. 28.

he profeſſed the faith of the conuenticle of Trent, or liued like the Popiſh monkes of theſe times. Vſuardus ſaith, he liued in the territory of Lyon: which is farre from Burgundy. and as for Gregory of Tours, he is as much to be beléeued, as the booke de geſtis Romanorum, or Amadis de Gaule, or Orland the furious. The Roman Martyrologe addeth Macarius, Ruffinus, Iuſtus, and Theophilus. Molanus talketh of one Baſil companion with Procopius. But if the Papiſts vnderſtand by Ruffinus him, againſt whom Hierome doth write, they worſhip an Origenian heretike. If they worſhip the reſt, they worſhip they know not whom.

CHAP. III.

Of the Romiſh Saints mentioned and worſhipped in the calendar of the moneth of March.

THe Moneths of March and Aprill ſhall not néede any large diſcourſe to declare the incongruities and abſurdities of the Romiſh church in the canonizing, calendring and worſhipping of Saints, ſéeing the former abuſes generally are committed throughout the whole calendar. Yet ſhall it be neceſſary to ſay ſomewhat particularly for Parſons his particular ſatisfaction. But briefely, leſt I might ſéeme to cloy the reader with the repetition of his notorious fooleries.

MAR. 1. To beginne therefore with S. Dauid, who is ſet by Parſons in the forefront of all the Saints of this moneth, it is to be obſerued, that in the Roman Martyrologe and Vſuardus, he is omitted: which would not haue béene done, if he had béene canonized by the Pope. And not being by him canonized, it appeareth that it is not long ſince the Pope vſurped this authority. Beſide that, we doe not reade, that either he was made Archbiſhop by the Popes Bulles, or taught that doctrine, which now the pope teacheth. Parſons ſaith he founded 12. monaſteries, and for proofe referreth vs to Matthew of Weſtminſter an. 871. who there ſpeaketh not one word of him. He alledgeth alſo Ranulphus and Polydore. But neither

ther of them auerreth his words. The Spaniards this day worship Rodesind. The Roman Martyrologe and Vsuarde celebrat the memory of 260. Martyrs shot to death by the commandement of Claudius. But neither do we read, that Claudius was such a persecutor, nor that the Roman soldiors then vsed archery. The names, acts, and profession of these Martyrs lie hid in great obscurity. Saint Antonina is said to haue bene drowned in a lake nere to the city Cea. But no prose is brought but the Greke Menologe. Neither can Parsons shew vs, where this Cea with the lake may be.

The second Saint mentioned by Parsons is Cedda Bishop as he saith, of the Mercians, and of Lindisferne among the Northumbers. And for prose he referreth vs first to Bede lib. 1. c. 28. Where he hath not one word of Cedda: and next to Bede lib. 4. c. 3. Where he saith he was Bishop of Lichfeld, and not of Lindisferne in Northumberland. But he saith not, that he was Bishop by the grace of the sé of Rome, or beleeued the damned doctrine of Parsons and other Iebusites. The Roman Martyrologe addeth very many Martyrs, that suffered vnder Alexander the Emperor, and 80. Martyrs slaine by the Lombardes in Campania, for that they would not worship a goates head. But first these Martyrs, if they meane to pray vnto them would be named. Secondly it were reason, that we had more certeinty of them, then the Papists haue of these Martyrs. For Alexander fauoured Christians, and massacred them not. The Lombardes were Christians, and worshipped no goates head. MAR. 2.

Hemiterius and Chelidonius saith Parsons, were two noblemen of Spaine, who hauing beene captaines in warre offered themselues to Martyrdome in the city of Leon. But the Roman Martyrologe confuteth his lying discourse, shewing that they were souldiers, and Martyred at Calagurris. He alledgeth also Prudentius in hym. sacr. For witnesse of his sayings: who doth not in ancient copies once mention these two. If then the verses reported by Baronius be found in late copies, it is an argument, that Popish falsaries vnder the names of ancient authors cõmend vnto vs their own errors MAR. 3.

and

and foleries. the Roman Martyrologe addeth Marinus, Asterius and others, and among them Chunegundis a maried mayden, and a virgin; which Parsons doth so much deride speaking of Ioan Lashford, who notwithstanding was neuer maried. Of her the legend reporteth, that striking her sisters daughter on the cheeke, the print of her hand remained on her face euer after. *Maxillam eius percussit*, saith the legend *quæ quasi sigillum quoddam formam digitorum accepit.*

MAR. 4. Lucius the predecessor of Cornelius was Bishop of Rome, and a constant professor and Martyr for the truth of Christ Iesus. But now the Popes of Rome are no Bishops, neither doe they professe the sincere faith, but rather Martyr the true professors thereof. Why then is Lucius brought forth for a witnesse of the Popes doctrine? The Romish Martyrologe addeth 900. Martyrs, all at a clappe, which are buried in the Cemitery of Callistus. But there is no certeinty of the time of their suffering. *de tempore passionis eorum nihil prorsus penes antiquos* saith Baronius in his notes. Leo the tenth he canonized S. Casimir, the sonne of King Casimir, who is worshipped at Vilna in Lituania. But how can he make saints that was no saint? againe how came the Pope to vsurpe this authority, which in time paste belonged to euery Bishop, as the discourse of Baronius in his notes testifieth?

MAR. 5. Theophilus was in his time bishop of Cesarea, and oppugned the heresie of the Quartodecimans, that endeuoured to bring backe the rites of the Iewes into the church. But that he stode with Victor the Bishop of Rome against them, as Parsons relateth, it is vtterly false. Further it appeareth not, that he acknowledged the Bishop of Romes authority in any thing, assembling himselfe a synode, and condemning the quartodecimans without him. On this day Molanus sheweth, that S. Drausius is worshipped at Soissons. But what he was, it appeareth not. The Roman Martyrologe telleth a horrible tale of S. Phocas Martyr. For to proue his triumph ouer the serpent the diuell, the author thereof saith, that euery one, that is bitten by a serpent, is healed presently,

if he beleeue and touch the doore of the church of Phocas. A matter hardly to be proued by Parsons, and all his companions, though they bite like serpents.

Euagrius Bishop of Constantinople neuer acknowledged the Bishop of Rome to be his superior. Furthermore he was most vnlike to the moderne Popes, that suffer nothing for religion, but regne and wallow in worldly delites, persecuting all, that speake against them. Why then is he by Parsons preferred before all the saints of this day, being not once mentioned by Vsuardus? Molanus consigneth this day to Cyril, of mount Carmell, Quiriacus, abbot Fridolin, and others. The Roman Martyrologe mentioneth S. Conon, who hauing nailes driuen into his feete and being commanded to runne before the Chariot of Decius, fell vpon his knees, and so praying died. But the only praise of this storie is deriued from the lying Menologe of the Greekes. MAR. 6.

Thomas of Aquin is this day set downe in redde letters by Robert Parsons. And yet was his doctrine no way consonant to the doctrine of the Apostles, nor doe the Iebusites admit all his interpretations and conclusions. He addeth also the names of Perpetua and Felicitas, and saith, that Tertullian in his booke de anima, and S. Austen Psal. 48. and otherwhere doth speake abundantly of their praises, whereas neither of them doth either praise them, or mention them. Molanus saith, that Felicitas was deliuered of child at the requeſt of holy men the eight moneth. But why should they rather requeſt, that she might be deliuered the eight moneth, then at her due time, no reason is alligned. Both the Roman Martyrologe, and Vsuardus mention diuers saints: so that if Papists loke not well to their matters; they will hardly be able to know, which way to turne themselues. MAR. 7.

Felix the onely saint of this day by Parsons his calendar, is the last, and most barely mentioned in the Roman Martyrologe. This man saith he, came from Burgundy and was the first preacher, that conuerted the East Angles. But this ouerturneth quite his whole discourse of 3. conuersions, wherein he endeuoureth to proue, that England was conuerted MAR. 8.

ted thrise by preachers sent from Rome. the Roman Martyrologe and Vsuardus this day celebrate the memory of Arianus, Theolicus, and other three, which being drowned in the sea had their bodies brought on shore by dolphins. Vsuardus saith by one Dolphin. *Obsequio delphini*, saith he, *corpora eorum littori sunt restituta.* For we must understand, that vnlesse Dolphins had holpen the Papists, they could not haue proued the worship of these saints bodies. It may be also, that some Dolphin can tell vs the names of these three nameless Martyrs.

MAR. 9. This 9. of March is diuided among 40. Martyrs, or rather as Parsons saith, among 39. soldiors, and their keper, who supplied the place of the fortieth souldior, that plaied the apostata, and leapt out of a frozen pond into a warme bath. Which being seene by the keper, he vpon a vision of 39. crownes sent downe by Angels to Crowne them, put off his cloathes, and leapt into his place. For this is reported by Parsons, but without the authority of any witnesse. He alledgeth Gregory Nazianzen and Basill in two seuerall sermons. But Gregory Nazianzen hath no sermon of this argument. Basill hath no such foolish tales. Other Martyrologes adde other saints, euery author framing to himselfe saints and legendes according to his owne fancy.

MAR. 10. Macharius Bishop of Hierusalem is worshiped by Parsons the 10. day of March. and why trow you? Forsooth because by his exhortation Constantine and Helene built churches to Christ and his saints, as he saith. but he lieth most egregiously. For none of his witnesses doe testifie that Churches were built to saints. May the Roman Martyrologe doth only say, that Churches were built by his exhortation, but speaketh nothing of saints. The same Martyrologe doth also mention diuers other saints. But none of the moderne Romish saith. Molanus doth adde saint Himelin a Scotish saint, that died of the plague. Doe you thinke then, that saints can deliuer others, that cannot deliuer themselues?

MAR. 11. Sophronius Bishop of Hierusalem, and mentioned by Parsons vpon the 11. of March was no subiect of the Bishop of Rome.

Rome. Molanus saith, that his name was put into the tables of the church by the decree of the first synode of Constantinople. it appeareth therefore, he was not canonized by any Pope. The Roman Martyrologe doth put diuers other Martyrs before him. But Parsons taketh at all aduentures, and setteth downe whom he pleaseth.

Gregory the first Bishop of Rome is much beholden to Parsons, that canonizeth him for a double saint, and setteth his name and quality downe in redde letters. But little doth he make for his, or his holy fathers aduantage. For he acknowledged himselfe Mauritius the Emperors subiect. These make the Emperors to be subiect to the Pope. He sent men to conuert Pagans to christian religion, and no armies to conquer our countrie. Now of late the Popes haue sent diuers cutthroates and powder-men and miners by treason to murder Christians; and false teachers to turne Christians from the faith. Finally, he was ignorant of the faith of the conuenticle of Trent, though more superstitious, then his predecessors. This day also the memorie of Mamilianus, and Peter Diocletians chamberleine is celebrated, who for his faith is called Peters heire. Are they then to be esteemed Peters heires, that bring in strange faithes? MAR. 12

The 13. day is dedicated by Parsons to Sabinus an Ægyptian saint. But why he should preferre him before the saints of other nations, he can yeld no good reason. This day we finde in other calendars the names of Macedonius, Patricia, Modesta, Euphrasia and other saints. But of their faith there is no record, neither is any authenticall author produced for proofe of their acts. MAR. 13.

47. Martyrs conuerted by S. Peter and Paul being in prison are this day honored by Parsons. But yet he cannot tell how to call them. Againe, if either S. Peter were neuer at Rome, or else did not conuert these 47. Martyrs, then for 47. Martyrs, he worshippeth 47. Idols. This day also the Papists call vpon Euphrasius, as they did the day before vpon Euphrasia. They forget not also to honor Mathilda the mother of Otho the Emperor. For such women are able to MAR. 14.

shew fauour to those saint-makers. Baronius in his notes vpon occasion of this name mentioneth Mathilda the great fauorite of Gregory the 7. and calleth her *Propugnaculum ecclesiæ*, that is, the Bulworke of the church, or rather the Popes paramour.

MAR. 15. Aristobulus Pauls scholar, as Parsons calleth him, is no good witnesse for Parsons the Popes scholar and parasite. The Roman Martyrologe putteth Longinus before him, and addeth Matrona a bond slaue, Menignus a fuller, and Speciosus a Monke who e soule Germanus saw caried into heauen. And the rather I name the fuller, and the bondwoman, that Parsons hereafter doe not despise Christian Martyrs by reason of their meane estate. That Germanus saw the soule of Speciosus the Monk, is a Monkish fable. Longinus seemeth to be a counterfeit saint, and to haue his name deriued of Λογχη. In the Lombardicall legend numb. 47. we read, that he was blind, and piercing our Sauiours side receiued his sight by some droppe of blood, that by chance touched his eies. But if he were blind, how could he see to pierce our Sauiours side? It is reported further, that he ledde a Monasticall life 38. yeares, and for Christian religion had his teeth striken out, and his tongue cut off and yet spoke neuer the worse. Some suspect he might lisp for want of teeth, others wonder at these fabulous narrations told with such confidence.

MAR. 16. For proofe of the Martyrdome of Iulianus, to whom Parsons giueth the 16. of March, he alledgeth the Roman Martyrologe and Greeke Menologe, bookes as full of fables, as himselfe is full of vanity and folery. But if he take them for good authors, why omitteth he the rest of their saints whose sanctification hath the same grounds? the Roman Martyrologe telleth how S. Papas being tied to a tree, and Martyred, made the same of barren to become fruitfull. If Parsons were tied to the tree, that hath so long looked for him at Tyburne, I doubt he would not make it fruitfull, though percase his traitourous disciples would honour him for a martyr.

This

This day by the Romish Martyrologe is consecrated principally to Ioseph of Arimathea, who as Capgraue and diuers others haue related, first conuerted the Britans to the Christian faith. But Parsons of spite omitteth him, because his story doth ouerthrow his whole brablement about three conuersions of England, and assigneth this day to S. Patrike, who, as he saith, was sent by Pope Celestine to preach to the Scottes and Irish. But Baronius a better storian then he, correcteth his folery, and telleth him, that it was Palladius, and not Patricius, that was first sent to the Scottes. The Romish Martyrologe doth shew, that he preached Christ in Ireland. *Primus ibidem Christum euangelizauit.* He was therefore vnlike to Parsons, and his cogging mates, that come not to preach Christ, but Antichrist, and to commend the Popes broken wares. He telleth how he wrought infinit miracles. But it were a greater miracle, to beleeue all, that is said in the legend of him. In his legend we reade, how a theefe hauing stollen a sheepe, and concealing it, S. Patrike made the sheepe to blait out of his belly. There also it is said, that Saint Patrike stroke the king through the foote with his staffe, and that he endured it. Loe a rude stroke with a staffe, and a patient king. In S. Patrikes Purgatory they tell vs of Soules fried in frying pans. And many such terrible matters. Other Calendars ioyne with Saint Patrike S. Gertrude, king Pipins daughter, and S. Gummarus and other saints. Whereby we see, that the Popes by their impostures and fraudulent promises of heauen made to their benefactors, got to themselues great riches on earth, as appeareth by the donations of Pipin, Charles and Lewes. MAR. 17.

King Edward called the Martyr was slaine by the practise of Elfthride, and others, because being a bastard he vsurped the crowne, being set forward by the Popish prelates. This is plainly declared by Osberne, albeit others goe about what they can, to conceale the turpitude of this matter. Parsons therefore had small cause to make him a Martyr, and the only saint of this day. Furthermore he quite mistaketh the matter, turning Elthfride into Alphred, and calling her Ed- MAR. 18.

wards step-mother, that was the only wife of Edgar, and was maried to him not long before his death. The Romish Martyrologe addeth Alexander, Narcissus, and ten thousand Martyrs, that suffered at Nicomedia, and diuers others. Molanus to all these Martyrs addeth the Archangell Gabriel. but that addition is but of a late inuention.

MAR. 19. Speaking of Ioseph the spouse of the blessed Virgin, all antient Fathers, saith Parsons, doe write high praises of this holy man, as may be seene in their workes: and yet he nameth neither one holy father, nor directeth vs to one of their workes. Baronius saith, that his actes deserued not to be written of others, then the holy Euangelists. Molanus citeth only Bernard, and certaine latter writers. Other Calendars ioyne with Ioseph, Quintus, Quintilla, Marcus, Laudoaldus, Amantius and diuers others. But they haue no other witnesses of their actes and holinesse, then the writers of legends.

MAR. 20. Cutbert by consent of a Synode was chosen Bishop of Lindisferne, as Parsons himselfe confesseth: and therefore we may not imagine him to haue beene a creature of the Popes making. Many miracles are reported of him, but more fables. The Roman Martyrologe therefore putteth him last, albeit Parsons set him formost. The same also celebrateth the memory of Ioachim father to the virgin Mary, of Archippus, and diuers other saints. But he is simple, that supposeth these Saints to haue professed the Romish faith, or that beleeueth, they haue receiued anie holinesse by the Popes canonization.

MAR. 21. Benedictus was the founder of Benedictine Monkes. But whether he did therein well, or euill, it will appeare at that day, when the secrets of mens hearts shall be reuealed. His rule, as we see plainly, was a deuice of man, and not of God. His miracles are very ridiculous, and meere fables. neither should a man doe right to Gregory the first, to thinke that he either wrote them, or beleeued them. The Calendars therefore might well haue preferred the Martyrs, that suffered vnder Constantius and others, before him.

MAR. 22. Saint Leta soly honoured by Parsons on this day, by the Romish

Romish Martyrologe is called Lea, and is cleane omitted by Vsuardus. The same day therefore the Romans doe celebrate the memory of Paulus the Bishop of Narbona the disciple of the Apostles, of Epaphroditus and other martyrs. Molanus addeth lame S. Margaret. But neither did the Apostles scholars teach any new faith beside that, which they had receiued of the Apostles; nor did Lea, or Lea hold other articles of faith, then such as she had learned of Saint Hierome. What lame Margaret beleeued lusty captaine Cowbucke cannot tell.

Victorianus and other Martyrs suffered death for the catholike faith vnder Hunericus. Why then is he only mentioned by Parsons? And what aduantage thinketh he to winne by his testimony, that was slaine for the true faith, who striueth only for the Popes prerogatiues? The Roman Martyrologe telleth vs, that a certeine Monke being put into a hot burning ouen by the Gothes, was there found the next day without hurt, and we will very willingly beleeue so much, if Friar Parsons will shew it, by his example, that such a matter is likely to haue beene done. MAR. 23.

Parsons this day remembreth only Timolaus and his fellowes. The Romish Martyrologe remembreth Pigmenius and Epigmenius and many more. But none of them can be proued to professe the moderne faith of Rome. The same mentioneth a child called Symeon killed by the Iewes at Trent. Which was a prognostication, that the Pope and his followers in the same place would endeuour to crucifie Christ in his members, and in the subuersion of the true Christian faith. MAR. 24.

Vpon the 25. day of March Parsons contenteth himselfe with the feast of the Annuntiation only. But the Romish Martyrologe addeth S. Quirinus, 262. Martyrs, the holy theefe, abbat Hermeland and others. Molanus ioyneth Saint Humbert with the rest. But what most of these saints were, there is scarce any memoriall left. How then shall we beleeue, they died for Christ, or held the true faith? Beside that, it is somewhat presumptuous, to celebrat the memory MAR. 25.

of saints together with the remembrance of the mysteries of our redemption. Finally the three on the crosse died for his offences and not for Christ.

MAR. 26. Eutychius and his fellowes were no fellowes for Parsons, and his fellow Iebusites. For they rebelled not against Constantius, though otherwise an heretike; and died for the maintenance of the Catholik faith. But these teach rebellion, and die not for religion, but for treason.

MAR. 27. Of All saints commonly Parsons maketh choice of Ægyptians, in life and conditions very well resembling them. Here he giueth the 27. day to Iohn an Heremite of Ægypt. And yet the testimony of this Heremit will nothing releeue this Iebusite.

MAR. 28. Priscus, Malchus and Alexander were deuoured of beasts for reproouing the persecutors for shedding innocent blood. So likewise are many good men deuoured by the beastly inquisitors, which faile not to kill them, that shall mislike their doings. These are therefore alledged and sanctified by Parsons against his owne cause and consorts. Other Calendars celebrate this day the feast of king Gunthram, a great friend no doubt, to Monks and priests, or else he should haue beene blotted out of their bookes.

MAR. 29. Among all the Martyrs calendred this day Parsons chuseth out one Cyrill a deacon. And yet he died for professing Christ vnder Iulian the Apostata, and not as the Iebusites doe, for professing the Pope, that is rightly termed Antichrist, and for high treason. Molanus addeth Marcus Arethusius, whom Nazianzen praiseth Orat. 1. cont. Iulian. But Baronius in his notes vpon this day reiecteth him for an heretike. So it appeareth, that Papists worship some for Saints, that of others are condemned for heretikes.

MAR. 30. Vpon this day Parsons solemnizeth the feast of 3150. Martyrs slaine by the procurement of Macedonius an heretike. And yet neuer a one of them professed the same faith, that Parsons doth. Furthermore how can he call vpon them, whose names he knoweth not? May allowing the painting and figuring of the holy ghost, how can he be of the communion

munion of those, that died for defence of the Deity of the holy Ghost: for the Deity is not by any meanes to be figured.

Here Parsons omitting Amos, and the Martyrs that suffered in Africa, chuseth out Balbina a virgin and Martyr. But holy Virgins haue no societie with lecherous Masse-priests, and Iebusites, neither holy Martyrs with wicked heretikes and sectaries professing a decretaline and new deuised faith neuer heard of in the time of ancient Martyrs. MAR. 31.

CHAP. IIII.

Of Saints calendred by the Romanists *in the moneth of* Aprill.

HVgh Bishop of Grenoble, as the Roman Martyrologe testifieth, lined many yeares in the wildernesse. But if he forsoke his Bishoprick, euill doth he deserue the first place among the Saints of this moneth, which Parsons doth giue them. For our sauiour Christ willed Peter and his successors, to feede, and not to abandon their sheepe. And the Apostle willeth him, that hath an office, to attend his office, and not to runne sculking into an heremitage, or into a wildernesse. APR. 1.

Franciscus de Paula was a creeping, lowry, hypocriticall Frier, the founder of a sect of the Franciscans, and therefore pleaseth the Friarlike humor of Parsons best, albeit he haue no better testimony then a bull of Leo the 10. a man as farre from holinesse, as heauen is from earth. But reason and religion would, that he should haue preferred Christian Martyrs before him, being the instituter of a counterfet & feined religion. Other calendars doe here mention Mary of Ægypt a wild saint, or rather a sauage woman of the wildernesse. The legend saith, she liued of three loaues, which were as hard as stones 47. yeares, and making the signe of the crosse walked ouer the water. With such fables are simple Papists fed, or rather deluded, and as good had they to gnaw stones, as to feede on these foleries. APR. 2.

APR. 3. Saint Richard of Chichester is canonized a double saint by Parsons for his miracles wrought at his tombe after his death. But Christians are in true accompt to be esteemed holy for their faith and holy life, and not for miracles, which may be either wrought by the power of Satan, or forged by craftie Priests and other deceitfull men. Molanus saith he was canonized by Pope Vrbane. And euery man may suppose, not without great bribes, that worke in the Romish court no small miracles. Other calendars mention Agapis and Chionia, which, as it is said, being long famished in prison, and afterward cast into the fire, which had no power to hurt thē, yelded their spirites to God praying. But they that testifie this, are writers of legends & calendars in credit like to Parsons. Ye for proofe of Richard of Chicesters holinesse sendeth vs to Matt. of Westminster, an. 1244. where there is no mention made of him.

APR. 4. Isidorus of Siuil by Parsons called Isiodorus, and by him sainted, knew no part of the new doctrine of the conuenticle of Trent. And therefore may well be put out of the rolle of Romish saints. As well certes might Parsons haue omitted him, as he omitteth Saint Ambrose, who is this day mentioned in other calendars. For both of them are a like vnacquainted with Popish nouelties.

APR. 5. Irene a holy virgin of Thessalonica was done to death, as they say, for hiding holy scriptures from the fury of those, that meant to burn them. And therefore is ridiculously mentioned on the fifth of Aprill by Parsons, whose consorts burne scriptures translated into English, and all that haue them without licence, if they can. Molanus this day celebrateth the feast of Tigernac a Scotish saint, and Cilinia mother to Saint Remi. But God knoweth, what faith they professed.

APR. 6. Sixtus was Bishop of Rome, and a Martyr. But if he had beene like to Clement the eight, or Paul the fifth; then had he beene no Bishop, nor Martyr, but a great ruler of kingdoms, and a procurer of Martyrdome to others. Parsons therefore may doe well to blot him out of his calendar together with all other ancient bishops and Martyrs.

Hegesippus

Hegesippus was no writer of legends, nor a Rapsodist like Baronius or Iacobus de Voragine, but a true reporter of the history of the church. Neither did he by the exhortation of Anicetus write his history, as Parsons saith, but he wrote, as hee came to Rome, as Eusebius lib. 4. hist. c. 8. testifieth. Molanus to increase the army of Romish saints addeth Saint Albert a recluse heremit, and Herman a Monke. But whether they believed in God, or not, we have no certeine knowledge. APR. 7.

Dionysius Bishop of Corinth was a learned Bishop, and therefore unlike the unlearned false Bishops the Popes creatures, and much wronged, when he is reckened for a defender of the new Tridentine faith. Molanus to helpe this error addeth Albert the father of the order of mount Carmell, and S. Ademus, a Monke, whose noble acts are set downe in Metaphrastes, an author for saints as credible, as he that wrote the legends of king Arthur, is for knights. APR. 8.

Prochorus was one of the 7. Deacons, and a follower of the Apostles doctrine. What maketh he then among Monks and Friers, of which he had no knowledge? The Roman Martyrologe addeth the passion of 7. Virgins, which, as the author thereof saith, paying the price of their blood bought eternall life. But the Apostles doctrine teacheth us, that Christs blood is the only price of our redemption. Molanus here talketh of the translation of the body of Saint Hugh Bishop of Roan, and Monica Mother to Saint Augustine. Matters plainly shewing, that the rotten religion of papists consisteth for the most part in rotten bones. The Spanish calendar mentioneth Casilda a holy mayden. But what faith she professed, we know not, neither doth the author of the calendar relate. APR. 9.

This day Parsons doth consecrate to Terentius, and his followes, whose reliques were translated, as he saith, to Constantinople. And for proofe he citeth Theodoret lib. 2. collect. But first Theodoret never wrote any such booke. It seemeth he mistooke Theodoret for Theodorus Lector. Secondly, no reason can be alledged, why their reliques should be translated APR. 10.

slated to Constantinople. For as for Theodorus his collectanea they deserue no credit. Thirdly there is no reason, why Terentius should be named, more then Africanus or Pompeius, which were his fellowes, or that these should be preferred before Ezechiel the Prophet, who is said to haue béene buried in the sepulcher of Sem, and Arphaxad, and whose memory is this day celebrated; and before other martyrs, that suffered at Rome and Alexandria. Finally all this argueth, that Martyrs in time past were only remembred and reuerenced, and not called vpon, nor praied to.

APR. 11. Leo the bishop of Rome hath double honour giuen vnto him by Parsons the 11. of Aprill. And yet is he but a single witnesse for the inuocation of Saints, and other points of Popery. The Roman martyrologe mentioneth Antipas, of whom S. Iohn speaketh Apocal. 2. and Dominio bishop of Salona, and Philip of Creta, and others. But none of these digressed from the faith of the Apostles, which we professe, and which the Popes of Rome by their traditions haue altered. Molanus addeth S. Guthlac, an English heremite, S. Godobert, and S. Agyricus, an Abbat of Tours. But these are Saints of a latter stampe; yet ignorant of the doctrine of Trent.

APR. 12. Iulius Bishop of Rome, saith Parsons, recalled from banishment S. Athanasius and diuers other Bishops. And he alleadgeth for proofe Athanasius his 2. Apolog. & Epist. ad solit. vit. agentes. But Vsuardus telleth vs, that himselfe was banished by Constantius the Emperour ten moneths. How then could he call others from banishment, that himselfe was banished? Further all histories shew, that about the times of Iulius, and long after, the bishops of Rome were subiect vnto the Roman Emperors. Finally neither doth Athanasius speake that, which Parsons reporteth of him, nor is Iulius a witnesse for the Popes tyrannie & Antichristianity.

APR. 13. The workes of Iustin Martyr yet extant do declare, how much the Papists are degenerated from ancient Christians in faith, in sacraments and maners. Little reason therefore hath Parsons to put him in his calendar.

Tiburtius,

Tiburtius, Valerianus and Maximus, ſaith Parſons, were conuerted to the Chriſtian faith by S. Cecilia, and baptized by Vrbanus. But the Roman Martyrologe ſpeaketh only of the firſt. The words are, *quorum primi exhortatione B. Cecilie ad Chriſtum conuerſi.* Further, this he weth firſt, that lay men and women are not to content themſelues, with an implicit faith, or to beléeue as the Church beléeueth, but to learne all particular points neceſſary to ſaluation. Next, that women are not to baptize. Héere alſo is Parſons his impudency refuted, that ſo often raileth at Chriſtian Martyrs, for talking of Scriptures. APR. 14.

Baſiliſſa and Anaſtaſia were diſciples of the Apoſtles, and martyred for their conſtancy in profeſſing the faith. But if they were the Apoſtles ſcholars, as the Roman Martyrologe affirmeth; then did they profeſſe no other faith, than that, which the Apoſtles taught. If they were martyred for profeſſing the faith; then were they vnlike to Popiſh women, that can ſay no more, than that they beléeue, as the Pope or Church of Rome doth; and to the Iebuſites, and their gunpowder complices that die for high treaſon. APR. 15.

Turibius biſhop of Aſturga expelled the Priſcillian hereſie out of Spaine, by his diligent preaching. But the popiſh Biſhops preach not, and the Iebuſites and their complices ſweare and forſweare themſelues, and vſe all maner of Aequinocations to deceiue, and kéepe their practiſes of treaſon ſecret, as the Priſcillianiſts were wont to doe. For this was a rule of theirs, *iura, periura, ſecretum prodere noli.* This holy biſhop therefore is no friend of theirs. APR. 16.

Anicetus was no mitred nor triple crowned Pope, but a godly Biſhop and Martyr, and notwithſtanding the diſſention about Eaſter betwixt him and Polycarpus, receiued him louingly. But now the Popes weare triple crownes, martyr Gods Saints, ouerrule the world, and excommunicate and maſſacre all that diſſent from them. Was not Parſons then aſhamed, to ſpeake this day of Anicetus? APR. 17.

Apollonius mentioned this day wrote an excellent diſcourſe in defence of Chriſtian religion, for which notwithſtanding APR. 18.

ſtanding

standing he was condemned by the Senate of Rome. So likewise diuers Christians are condemned by the Popes Senate of Cardinals and Inquisitors, albeit in writing and preaching they yeld reason of their Christian faith. This excellent man knew neither Pope, nor the moderne Romish faith, and is therefore foolishly put into the Romish Calendar.

APR. 19. The Romish Martyrologe this day celebrateth the memory of Timon one of the seuen Deacons mentioned Act. 6. But Parsons leaving him chooseth out Elphege bishop of Canterbury, as a man more neere approching to his humour. And yet was he not guilty of Iebusiticall heresies, nor was he martyred for Christian religion, but for denying to the Danes their tribute. Anselmus himselfe did much doubt of his martyrdome, and in the end resolueth, that he was a Martyr for iustice. But true Martyrs suffer for the faith of Christ Iesus.

APR. 20. Parsons this day celebrateth the feast of Sulpitius and Seuerianus martyrs conuerted, as is said, by the perswasions and miracles of Domitilla disciple of the Apostles. But the Romish Martyrologe and Vsuardus do call the second Seruilianus, and say that they were conuerted to the faith of Christ by the preaching of the Apostles scholar. So then we see, they were martyred for the faith of Christ, and not for the faith of the Pope, and that it is a commendation for Christian women to be able to instruct others in the faith. And that Christians are to follow the doctrine of the Apostles, and not of the Iebusites and Masse-priests, that are false Apostles.

APR. 21. Anselme is honored by Parsons this day for a bishop, and a Confessor: and yet he will not allow all his interpretations of Scriptures and opinions. Furthermore he fell out with his King, fled out of the land, stirred vp forren Princes against his Prince and Countrey: which be arguments rather of choler, than religion. Parsons saith, he liued vnder William Conquerour. But histories refute him, that shew how he liued vnder William Rufus.

APR. 22. Soter and Caius this day remembred by Parsons were preaching

preaching Bishops, and not murdering Popes. Further we read not, that either they caried themselues, as vniuersall Bishops of the Church, or wore triple crownes, or had their guard of Suizzars attending vpon them. For then they would not so easilie haue bene apprehended and martyred.

Now we are come to S. George, set forth as a Martyr by Parsons in red letters, yet with his halfe double feast. Percase at Rome he fedeth on cole and pottage, that in England was crammed with beefe and pies. But for feasting he deserueth to be set to fasting, vnlesse he plead the Popes cause better. For either this George was an heretiche, as Athanasius in his Epistle ad Orthodoxos sheweth, and the legend mentioning his contentions with Athanasius a Magician signifieth, or else is his story a mere fiction. Baronius in his notes doth rather intricate himselfe, than cleare the point. No man euer heard of a S. George, that killed a dragon nere Silena, and deliuered a virgin, ouercame Palestine, conuerted Alexandra the wife of Dacianus, and vnder him suffered such torments, as are described in the legend, in any authenticall history. Is not then the case of Parsons desperate, that will haue S. George worshipped, and yet cannot proue, that euer there was such a Saint? APR. 23.

Mellitus conuerted the East-Angles by preaching. He was not therefore of Parsons his humour, that anno 1588. procured as much as he could, the comming of the Spanish armada for the subuersion of his countrie, and of late laid a plot to blow vp the King, the Lords and commons of the Parliament. Neither did he preach the decrees of the conuenticle of Trent, or the Popes supreme monarchy ouer all nations. For then he would haue bene thrust headlong out of England. APR. 24.

Saint Marke taught no other doctrine then that which he had first learned of Saint Peter. much therefore is he wronged to be matched with Monkes and Friers, that taught another religion. The Roman Martyrologe saith, that after diuers torments he suffered for the Christian faith. he was, APR. 25.

saith

saith our author first visited by Angels, and afterward the Lord appearing to him, called vnto the kingdome of heauen. *primo Angelica visitatione confortatus, & demum ipso domino sibi apparente ad cœlestia regna vocatus.* Thus these fellowes mingling fables with truth bring great discredit to the Gospell.

APR. 26. Cletus and Marcellinus Bishops of Rome were no Idolaters. Marcellinus offered certaine graines of incense to an Idole, but it sore repented him, and grieuously was he censured for it by the counsell of Sinuessa, that then was aboue the bishop of Rome. Cletus abode in the steppes of S. Peter. The Popes therefore, and their new Romish doctrine haue not these two for any precedents.

APR. 27. Antimus Bishop of Nicomedia suffered *ob confessionem Christi*, for the confession of Christ, as ancient Martyrologies testifie, and therefore was not fitly ranged by Parsons among the witnesses of Antichrist. Iustinian, as Procopius writeth lib. 1. de ædific. Iustin. imper. built a noble memory in honor of him. But did not dedicate a church vnto him, as now the Papists vse to doe to their saints.

APR. 28. Vitalis, who in time past was remembred this day, was father to Geruasius and Protasius, and as famous a Martyr as the best: which sheweth that mariage is no impeachment to the honour of saints, nor inferior to widowhood or virginity.

APR. 29. This day by the Roman Martyrologe is dedicated to Tychicus Saint Pauls scholar, and other Martyrs. But Parsons leauing the rest singleth out one Peter a Dominican Frier, and an heretike preaching the Popes pardons and prerogatiues, and the worship of saints and other trash: and for this he is by him reputed a Martyr, albeit he suffered in some other brabble, seeking to bring Christians to trouble for the faith of Christ.

APR. 30. The last day of Aprill is kept holy by Parsons and his Popish crew to Erchenwald a Bishop. But Christians in time past kept daies holy to the Lord. Furthermore albeit for reward he was sanctified by the Pope; yet shall not Parsons

sons proue, that euer he professed the moderne Romish faith, or was such a bloody butcher, as Bonner his pretended successour.

CHAP. V.

Obseruations and collections out of the former discourse concerning calendars.

IN this sort, as you see, it were an easie matter to passe ouer the whole Romish calendar. But that, which is already set downe, is sufficient not only for our discharge, but also to charge our aduersaries, especially if we please to consider either the matters obiected by them, or else the course, that is obserued by vs.

For first we see, that the most of the ancient holy men mentioned in old calendars were either Apostles, or Prophets, or holy Martyrs. The rest were holy Bishops, or other Christians put to triall for the Christian faith. The women were either Martyrs, or constant Confessors of the truth. But the faith, which they died for and professed, is that, which we desire to be receiued, and freely euery where professed. The faith of Pius Quartus, and the conuenticle of Trent they neither did allow, nor know. What reason then haue Christians to follow Papists and to forsake ancient Fathers?

Secondly those Monkes, and Friers, and their complices, which by the Pope haue beene either for reward, or fauour added to the calendar, doe so much digresse from the Apostles and primitiue Christians, that we doe wonder, with what face our aduersaries durst ioyne them together in one calendar. If Parsons doe suppose, as sometimes he blusheth not to affirme, that the Apostles and ancient Christians doe nothing differ in matters of faith from him, and his consorts; then must he shewe, that the Apostles taught the carnall eating of Christs body, and that he hath flesh, that can neither be felt, nor seene, and that none but the Priest

is

is to receiue both the kindes in the eucharist, and that there are not two only, but 7. sacraments, all iustifying the receiuers, and that saints and Images are to be worshipped according to the practise of the Romish church, and the other articles of the moderne Romish faith. But this will be hard for him to performe.

Thirdly in ancient calendars holy men were remembred, not with a purpose to call vpon them, or to serue them, as giuers of graces, or mediators, that could heare vs, and pacifie Gods wrath for vs; but to the intent other Christians might be stirred vp to imitate their constancy in suffring for Christ, and other vertues.

Fourthly the reliques of holy Martyrs were in time past honorably interred. And thereupon it came to passe, that we see so many memorials of the deposition, or burial of holy men. Gregory the first thought it a matter intolerable and sacrilegious, to touch the bodies of saints, as it may appeare lib. 3. epist. 30. ad Constantiam. But now the Papists haue changed deposition into eleuation, and vsually do digge vp the bodies of the dead, and place their bones and reliques vpon altars and in shrines, tearing their saints, as the madde Bacchæ tore Pentheus.

Fifthly the Pope giueth to some saints double feasts, to some single, to others middle honors, making it a matter of his fauor and grace, to honor them, or not to honor them, and to giue them either more or lesse honor. But the calendars of old times shew vs, that the honour of Martyrs consisted in the reputation of seuerall Churches, and that the Bishop of Rome had no more to doe in this point, then other Bishops.

Sixthly the ancient Church did honor all Martyrs alike, and matched no Confessors with them in equall ranke. But now the Romish calendar is full of new saints; yea of such, as neither were Martyrs, nor Confessors. And the Pope oft times giueth more honor to a stinking Monke or Friar, then to an Apostle, or Prophet, or holy Martyr. As for example the feasts of Francis, and Dominike are double; whereas

whereas the feastes of diuers Doctors, and Martyrs are single.

Seuenthly, diuers are recorded as Martyrs, of whose confessions our aduersaries haue no certeinty. Nay oftentimes it falleth out, that they are very uncertein, whether any such men were euer in the world, or not.

Eighthly, they set them downe sometimes by 20. sometimes by 40. sometimes by hundreds, sometimes by thousands, without specifying the names, or speciall causes of their sufferings; which is reputed a great fault in M. Fox, who notwithstanding dealeth farre more particularly, then the authors of old Martyrologies.

Finally, all the obiections, that Parsons maketh either against the Martyrs of Christ Iesus, or against M. Fox, that recordeth their actes and sufferings, doe fall vpon his owne head, and vpon his owne saints and calendars, and that far more truly, then vpon those, against whom he inueigheth. He accuseth some Martyrs of felony, and treason. The like practise did the Gentiles vse against the auncient Martyrs. And most iustly may diuers of them be accused of both, whom the Papists honor as Martyrs.

He supposeth it a great fault in M. Fox, that the articles obiected to our Martyrs, together with their particular answers are not set downe fully. Yet we see the same hath happened in most of the actes and answers of ancient Martyrs.

To some Martyrs he obiecteth ignorance, to others peruersnesse and obstinacy, to many, that they were young, and artificers. All which the Pagans might as well obiect to ancient Martyrs. To conclude, sometime he findeth great fault, that authenticall proofes are not produced for matters alledged. And yet he hath no better, nor more authenticall testimony for the most part, then the reports of Symeon Metaphrastes, Surius, Iacobus de Voragine, Wandelbertus, Vsuardus, Romish Legends, and such like.

CHAP. VI.

That the Papists doe honour diuers Saints, which either neuer were in the world, or else are not certainely knowen to be such, as they are reported.

OVr Sauiour Christ reproued the Samaritans, Iohn 4. because they worshipped things they knew not. *Vos adoratis*, saith he speaking to a Samaritan woman, *quod nescitis.* You worship you know not what. But this more iustly may be spoken of the Papists. For either they worship fictions for saints, or beleeue things of them, of which they haue no sure grounds.

Parsons commendeth to his credulous followers the worship of S. Richard King of England, neuew to King Offa, and father to Willibald, Wimbald and Waldeburge. But neither our English Chronicles, nor our English calendars doe mention any such King, or saint. Secondly if there had beene any such King saint, it is not likely, that Capgraue would haue omitted him, or that Democh ares, or other strangers should speake of him, rather then his owne countrimen. Lastly it is not probable, that the English would haue left his body to be worshipped at Luca in Italy the seuenth of February, if they had euer had any such saint or king in England.

Molanus vpon the 9. of February sheweth, that S. Maingold, sonne of Hugh King of England is worshipped at Hoy. But our stories shew, that there neuer was either such a Kings son, or such a King. Our old calendars no where mention such a saint. The records of his acts and sanctity no where appeare.

Dorothea in the Lombardicall history is reported to bee the daughter of Dorus and Thea, who being put into a vessell of boyling oile felt no more hurt, then if she had beene anointed with balme. *Illesa manens, ac si balsamo vngeretur.*

geretur. It is said also, that she was nourished by Angels, and had three roses, and three apples brought her out of paradise by a boy with curled haire, and clad in purple, which she sent to Theophilus, Protonotary of the kingdome. But such a martyr is no where remembred to haue suffered vnder Diocletian in any authenticall history. Secondly the Lombardicall story saith she was tormented by Fabricius. But Parsons saith it was vnder Sapricius. Thirdly, hard it will be in those daies to find a kingdome, where Theophilus was Protonotary. Lastly, both the legend is fabulous, and Parsons his witnesses too weake to proue such a Martyr.

Cyriacus, that Pope, that accompanied the eleuen thousand virgins, is by the Papists held for a saint. And yet Baronius denieth, that there was euer any Bishop of Rome of that name.

Of Saint Martina and her Martyrdom, there is no other euidence to be found, but the Martyrologies of Bede and Vsuardus, and such Legendary authors, which haue passed through the hands of diuers falsaries. And yet is she worshipped as a saint, and it is said she conuerted 17. souldiers, which were all Martyrs afterward. If then Parsons can bring no better euidence then Baronius and Molanus haue done, not only Saint Martina, but also 17. other Martyrs supposed to be conuerted by her, are in some danger, and they that worship them, in greater.

Hippolytus is worshipped the 13. of August, as a Martyr, that suffered vnder Valerianus the Emperor, and was drawen in peeces, as they say, by wild horses. But this seemeth to be borowed out of a tragedy of Euripides, where Hippolytus the sonne of Theseus is said in this sort to haue beene torne in peeces: and the rather we are to beleeue it to be so, because we finde no such thing in any ancient authenticall author. Prudentius, he speaketh like a Poet, and as Baronius testifieth in his notes vpon the 30. of Ianuary, maketh one of three. Vsuardus and Beda haue beene patched together by diuers authors, and tell many things by hearesay. The rest deserue no credit.

Eutychius is honored as a Martyr the 4. of February. But there is no record of his acts, saith, or martyrdom now remaining, but one inscription only in a certain church fathered upon Damasus. But if we beleeue all inscriptions, we shall not be able to attaine to any certaine knowledge of things past.

The 9. of March 40. souldiers and Martyrs are honored by the order of the Roman Martyrologe. yet Parsons telleth, that their keeper saw in a vision only 39. crownes, because one of thē did play the apostata. so it appeareth, that in worshipping 40. soldiors the papists worship one apostata. neither is it materiall, that the keeper is said to leap into his place. For what instruction could he haue of christiā religion in so short a time? besides that, if it were granted, yet should not fourty soldiers be Martyrs, but 39. and a gaylor.

The 14. of March is dedicated to 47. Martyrs, which are said to be conuerted, and baptized by Saint Peter and Paul, while they remained prisoners at Rome. But this is not reported by any authenticall witnesse: and Surius, and Petrus de Natalibus are too yong to testifie any such matter. Beside this, many probable arguments are alledged, against the 25. yeares sitting of Peter at Rome. So then, you see, the credit of these 47. Martyrs, upon what a small threade, and how great vncertainty it dependeth.

Upon the 30. of March the memory of 3150. Martyrs put to death by cruell torments by the practise of Macedonius is celebrated. And yet who is able to say, that among all these, if so many did suffer, there was neither heretike, nor infidell? The credit of these mens Martyrdome dependeth vpon the report of Socrates, who, as our aduersaries say, was an heretike himselfe.

Saint George among the Papists is a renowmed saint. But such a saint, as they report this George to be, was neuer in the world. First it is said, that he conquered Palestine. *Palestinam*, saith he, *Christo fauente deuici*. Secondly, that a dragon did eate vp daily two sheepe, and afterward, a child and a sheepe, and in the end, that the kings daughter of Silena was to be giuen to the dragon. Thirdly that the dragon kept

in

in a lake. Belike it was a flying fish. Fourthly that Saint George made the dragon to follow this maiden like a gentle dog. *sequebatur eam velut mansuetissimus canis.* that Saint George killed the dragon, and that he was so big, that vneth foure yoke of oxen could draw him out of the city. Finally, that this conquerour of kingdomes & dragon-queller, after he had conuerted Queene Alexandra, should be tormented and slaine by Dacianus an obscure King of an vnknowen kingdome. Matters not only without all ground or testimony of story, but most absurdly and ridiculously deuised. Baronius himselfe confesseth, that the killing of the dragon is Symbolicall, that is, a signification of some thing represented by this similitude.

Saint Christopher is reported by Petrus * de Natalibus to be a man 12. foote long. Iames de Voragine leg. 95. stretcheth him out yet longer, and saith he was 12. cubites high. *duodecim cubitos in longitudine possidebat.* He telleth also, how he went to seeke the diuell, to serue him. *vado,* saith he in the Legend, *quærere dominum diabolum, vt ipsum in Dominum mihi assumam.* That is, I goe to seeke, as Christopher said, my Lord the diuell, that I may serue him. The legend telleth, how he caried Christ ouer sea. And that he conuerted eight thousand, that saw him pitch his staffe in the earth, and to cause it presently to beare leaues. There also we read, how he was tormented by King Dagnus, and shot with arrowes, and how one arrow rebounded backe, and stroke out the kings eie, and that the rest did hang floting in the aire, and touched him not. *Vna,* saith the legend, *de sagittis ab aere veniens, & retrò se vertens regem in oculo percussit.* And againe, *sagittæ omnes in aere suspendebantur.* Finally it is said that he conuerted 48. thousand men from Gentilisme to Christian religion. If Parsons be able to shew any such man, or King, or to proue these wonders; he shall deserue, not only to be Cardinall, but also to be caried on mens shoulders, if not ouer the sea, yet ouer the land, to the kingdome of Vtopia, and there to be made Pope.

* *Lib. catal. 6. c. 135.*

S. Catherine, as we read in the legend num. 168. was the

daughter of King Costus, and at the age of 18. yeares proued so learned, that in plaine field of disputation she ouercame 50. Philosophers, & made them mute: *muti penitus sunt effecti*. It is said also, that she conuerted them to Christian religion, & that the Emperour Maxentius incensed with fury caused them to be burned. Further diuers strange torments and miracles are there described. A strange engine was deuised to torment her withall. But see what happened. The Angell of God, saith the legend, turned the wheele with such violence, that it killed 4000. Pagans. *Angelus domini molam illam cum tanto impetu diuellēdo concussit, quod quatuor millia gentilium interemit.* Finally hauing conuerted the Queene and Porphyrius the Captaine of the Emperours army it is said, how she was beheaded. But such a King as Costus, such a Queene as the wife of Maxentius turned Christian, and such a Captaine as Porphyrius Captaine of Maxentius his army, and such a Martyr, as Catherine, in authenticall writers is not to be found. Baronius for Catharina writeth Hecaterina, and confesseth that diuers things in her acts are to be corrected. That Maxentius came to Alexandria, and had his wife conuerted, is repugnant to all storiers writing the story of Maxentius.

Saint Vrsula, as Iames de Voragine leg. 153. telleth, was the daughter of Nothus or Maurus a Christian King of Britaine. Baronius in nor. 21. octobr. saith, she was the daughter of Dionocus King of Cornewall. And both agree, that she was Martyred with 11000. Virgins. The former saith, that they went to Rome, and that the Pope Cyriacus, and Vincentius a Cardinall, and an Archbishop, and diuers Bishops, and Constantia the daughter of the King of Constantinople ioyned themselues to these 11000. virgins and were Martyred with them. But such a king of Britaine, as Notus or Maurus, or of Cornewall as Dionocus, and such a Pope as Cyriacus, and such an Emperour of Constantinople, is no where to be found. Furthermore it is absurd to thinke, that in those times 11000. virgins might be spared out of Cornewall, or that they should runne gadding to Rome, or that they should come al safely backe again, or that the Hunnes would kill

kill so many maidens. Nay about these times the Hunnes kept the seas, and came not nere Collein, where it is said they were Martyred. The best witnesse, that Baronius can find for iustification of this history is Gefrey of Monmouth a great fabler, and a fellow, to whom our aduersaries themselues giue no credit. But suppose he deserued any credit, yet doth he neither speake of any pilgrimage to Rome, nor of Collein. This is therefore no small blow to the Romish calendar, that it loseth 11000. and odde saints at a clappe.

Carinus and Leucius, as is reported in the 52. Legend of the Lombardicall history, were the sonnes of old Symeon, & passed together with our Saviour through hell and paradise, and rose with him. But if all authenticall histories be sought, no such saints wil be found. In the Roman Martyrologe we finde none such. Nor doth Baronius seme to make any accompt of them. The only testimony that maketh for them, is the apocryphall gospell of Nicodemus.

The name of Longinus is plainly forged, and deriued of λογχὴ, a speare. That the soldiors name, that pierced our sauiours side with a speare, should be Longinus, and turne Christian, hauing his eies opened with a droppe of our Saviors blod, is not found in any author of credit. Nay it is most absurd to thinke, that the Romans were serued with blind soldiors, or that a blind man could see to strike our Sauiour right in the side. It is said also, that the president caused his teeth to be strooken out, and his tongue to be cut out, and that he spoke, all this notwithstanding. *iussit præses*, saith Iames de Voragine. leg. 47. *dentes eius excuti, & linguam abscindi. Longinus tamen ex hoc loquelam non perdidit.* these things therfore seme to be forgeries of dreaming Monkes.

The acts also of Mary of Ægypt seme to be forged, if the saint herselfe be not a forged saint. For that a woman of such dissolute life should goe from Alexandria to Hierusalem to worship the crosse, or that such pilgrimages should be made to Hierusalem in those dayes for to worship the crosse, it is a matter very improbable. Likewise most strange it is, that is there reported, viz. that she receiued there 3. peeces of siluer,

and bought with them three loaues, & that the loaues should grow as hard as stones, and that she should notwithstanding liue with them 47. yeres in the wildernesse. Nicephorus lib. hist. 17. c. 5. doth mention such a woman, but he hath nothing of the three peces of siluer, or three loaues. Nay he saith, she liued without meat or cloathes: which no question is a tradition proceeding from some Monkish dreame.

The actes of Pancratius are so improbable, that they giue euident signes of forgery. For neither is it likely, that Diocletian would dispute with a child of 14. yeares, nor that Pancratius should doe more in punishing periured persons, then Saint Peter could. Yet Iames de Voragine leg. 71. affirmeth both. He telleth also, how a certeine false fellow laying his hand vpon Pancratius his tombe, and swearing false, could not take it from thence againe: *manum inde trahere non potuit*. But these are improbable leasings. the times also and names mentioned in histories agree not with the Legends. For in the legend it is said, he was martyred vnder Diocletian, and came to Rome in the daies of Cornelius the Pope: whereas by true chronology it appeareth that Cornelius died some 30. yeares before the Empire of Diocletian. Further the legend telleth, how one Cocauilla a senatrix buried Pancratius his body: whereas no authenticall history speaketh of women, that were senatrixes, nor mentioneth any woman called Cocauilla.

Very suspicious also is the report of Vitus his martyrdome. Iacobus de Voragine leg. 77. saith, he was martyred in Sicily, being but 12. yeares old. The Romish martyrologe Iunij 15. saith, that he and his nurse Crescentia were martyred in Italy. For as yet this yong demy God of Papists was not come from his nurse. In his Legend it is said, that the hand of Valerian, that commanded him to be beaten, dried vp: and that the Diuell being in Diocletians sonne should say (for among the Papists the Diuels testimony is good proofe) he would not come foorth, vntill Vitus came. But these are things forged without any testimony of authenticall history. For in them we do not reade any thing

thing of the poſſeſſion of Diocletians ſonne by the diuell. Nay it appeareth not by them, that he had any ſonne at all, or that there were ſuch men, as this Valerianus, or Vitus, nor doe they ſpeake of 7. Angels attending on him, or of Eagels feeding him. Neither doth Baronius finde any mention made of him, ſaue in the corrupt Martyrologies of Bede, Ado, and ſuch like.

Gelaſius diſt. 15. c. ſancta Romana, reiecteth the paſſion of Quiricus and Iulitta. Yet Iacobus de Voragine leg. 78. admitteth the ſame with the reſt. So doth Vſuardus alſo, and the Roman Martyrologe. Molanus ſaith, there died with Iulitta at Antioch foure hundred and foure more. But no more proofe is brought for them, then for Iulitta. Beſide that, Iacobus de Voragine ſaith, ſhe was Martyred at Tarſus. He telleth alſo how Quiricus being a child but of three yeares old confeſſed himſelfe a Chriſtian, and diſputed with the preſident: matters both falſely and fooliſhly deuiſed.

Petronell is ſuppoſed to be Saint Peters daughter, and to haue beene ſo faire, that Flaccus the Earle was exceedingly enamored of her. But neither doe authenticall ſtories ſpeake of any ſuch daughter of S. Peter, nor could ſhe be yong at this time, vnleſſe ſhe had beene begotten ſince it is ſaid, he ſate Biſhop of Rome. Furthermore at this time the Romans had no noblemen, called Comites abſolutely, or earles. Molanus alledgeth S. Auguſtine contra Adimantum c. 19. but there is no mention in that chapter of her name or actions. Baronius in not. mart. 31 alledgeth the ſame booke, c. 17. and yeldeth a reaſon of this addition of Flaccus Comes. But he laboureth in vaine. For neither hath Auguſtine any thing for him, nor doe the places by him mentioned ſpeake of Comites, taken abſolutely.

Seuen ſleepers are alſo worſhipped for ſeuen ſaints. But he that beleeueth, that they ſlept from the times of Decius to the reigne of Theodoſius, that is, as ſome accompt 181. yeares, had need of a medicine to cure his madneſſe, or of a goad to awake him out of his dull ſlumber. Baronius thinketh, that they died in the time of Decius, and being found afterward

afterward, were like, as if they had slept. But Metaphrastes and the most thinke otherwise. The whole discourse amounteth to no more, then a fable.

Petrus de Natalibus lib. 1. de sanct. c. 25. maketh mention of S. Barbara, a virgine of Nicomedia, that, as he saith, ranne through a mountaine, and in the end was beheaded by her owne father Dioscorus. But of such a barbarous father, and such a Barbara his daughter, no authenticall historie maketh mention. Vsuardus and Ado say, she was martyred in Tuscia, Metaphrastes, and Mombricius say, she suffered at Heliopolis. Baronius alledgeth no testimony for her, but out of lying legends.

The Jebusites will not beleeue the history of Pope Ioan: yet in the Lombardicall history leg. 79. we read, that one Marina professing her selfe a Monke all her life long was taken for a man. The like also is reported of Theodora leg. lomb. 87. hard then will it goe with those, that call vpon these saints, of whose sanctity and being we haue such reason to doubt.

In the 136. Legend of the Lombardicall history the Papists tell vs of Saint Maurice and 6666. Martyrs; imagining, because a full legion did sometime consist of that number, that there were then so many Martyrs. But he that shall call vpon these 6666. Martyrs, shall call vpon many, that neuer were in the world. For first the legions were seldome complete, and hardly shall any man finde a legion, that consisted of that number.

In England during the times of ignorance and blindnesse S. Edward the King, and S. Elphege Archbishop of Canterbury were worshipped for Martyrs: yet were neither of them slaine for matters of faith, but the first about the right of the crowne, the second for mony matters.

Finally the Legends are so full of fables, and so contrarie to authenticall histories, that euery man of iudgement or learning may see, that many are set downe for Martyrs, that either neuer were in the world, or else neuer died for Christian religion, or at the least not so, as is reported.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

That Papists worship for Saints, some that were Pagans, others that were Iewes *in religion and refused* Christ, *diuers that were either heretikes or traitors, or at the least wicked men, & many of whose faith in earth, and saluation in Heauen they haue no certainety.*

BE not yoaked, saith the Apostle 2. Cor. 6. with infidels. And he yeldeth this reason. For that there is no participation, betwixt righteousnesse and vnrighteousnesse, nor fellowship betwixt light and darkenesse, nor agreement betwixt Christ and Beliall. Yet such a confusion haue our aduersaries made of all matters, that they not onely toyne Monkes and Friars and other Disciples of Antichrist, with Christs Apostles and his true Martyrs, but oftentimes also adore them for saints and Martyrs, which by the confession of the soundest of their owne sort, or at least by good arguments are declared to be either Pagans or Iewes, or traitors, or heretikes, or wicked men, or at least men of doubtfull faith.

That the souldior that pierced Christs side was an infidel, it is apparant. For otherwise he would neuer haue offered that violence to the Sauiour of the world. That he is a damned creature, it may probablie be gathered out of the first of the Reuelation. For after these words, and those which pierced him, it followeth, and all the tribes of the earth shall lament ouer him. Neither doth any authenticall story speake of his conuersion. Yet doe the Papists worship this souldier vnder the name of Longinus.

When 40. souldiers, whose memory is celebrated the 9. of March, were Martyred at Sebasta; one plaid the Apostata, and a Gentile, that was their keper, or executioner put himselfe

himselfe in his place. It is necessary therefore, that those which worship these 40. Martyrs, do either worship a Pagan not instructed in the faith, or an Apostata.

We doe not read in any authenticall story, that any called Hippolytus was torne in peeces, being made fast to a chariot drawen by wild horses, but the sonne of Theseus. and yet this Hippolytus, as before we have said, is worshipped as a Martyr.

Saint Catherine is said to have overcome 50. Philosophers, and to have converted them in such sort, that they said, they would die for Christ. Yet in that short space could they not learne the articles of the faith. Doe not they then all, that worship them for Martyrs, take Pagans for Martyrs?

In Saint Patrikes legend, which in number is the 49. we read, that a crosse was set over a Pagan, and that he was worshipped for a saint. *Crux*, saith Iames de Voragine, *posita est super Paganum.* But Saint Patrike espied the error. Doe we not then thinke, that this is the case of many that are worshipped for saints?

Finally when so many dead mens bones and ashes are worshipped in every corner, where Popery reigneth, what assurance can any man have, that he doth not worship the bodies and bones of Pagans? We read in the Legend of S. Iohn Baptist, that his bones were mingled with the bones of Pagans. How then could his bones be discerned from others? They say, they shined in the night. But that is nothing but a Monkish dreame. When Marke was translated from Alexandria to Venice some doubted not to affirme, that for S. Marke, the body of some Aegyptian was brought to be worshipped. The best notes of distinction, which Papists use to alledge, are dreames, visions, and fables.

Herodes sonne is said to be slaine among the children of Bethlehem Iuda. Doe not they then worship the sonne of a proselyte Iew, and an enemy to Christ, that worship the innocentes for Martyrs?

Gamaliel was also an incredulous Iew, and a Pharisie, as is recorded in the acts of the Apostles. So likewise was

Nicodemus

Nicodemus, that came to Iesus by night. For if he had beleeued in Christ, he would not haue feared to confesse him. Yet both these haue place among the Romish saints, and much are their reliques estæmed of them.

Helene is worshipped at Rome, as a great saint the 18. of August. Yet in the legend of Sylvester the Papists make her in religion a Iew. For there it is said, that she did eagerly reprehend her sonne Constantine, for that leaving the God of the Iewes he worshipped a man, that was crucified. *Durè increpat, quod relicto Deo Iudæorũ, Crucifixum hominem, vt Deum colat.* Neither doth it appeare, that euer she changed her religion: if any credit be to be giuen to Romish legendicall traditions.

Papias held the heresie of the Millenarians, as both Eusebius hist. lib. 3. and Hierome in catal. Script. eccles. and others testifie. and yet is he honored as a saint the 22. of February. The same error was common to Ireneus, and other fathers. And yet diuers of them are honored, as holy men and saints.

Saint George of Capadocia is reputed a great saint by diuers nations, and called on in battell, as a great warriour. yet Athanasius in epist. ad Orthodoxos doth testifie, that he was an Arian heretike: neither are we to doubt, but that both he, and the legend speaketh of one man. For in the legend of S. George in Metaphrastes we reade, that as George is commended for a Martyr, so Athanasius is condemned for a magician, and a wicked man.

Molanus reckeneth Marcus Arethusius for a Martyr, and celebrateth his memoriall the 29. of March. But Baronius condemneth the same man for an Arian heretike, as appeareth in his notes.

Ruffinus by some is reputed a Saint, as before is noted. But the most doe now hold him for an Origeman Heretike.

Hermannus for 30. yeares was held a saint, and worshipped at Ferrara. But Boniface the 8. as is recorded in his life, caused him to be decried, and condemned him for an Heretike.

Finally the ancient fathers condemned for heretiks those, that

that worshipped Images, and Angels, and offered cakes in the honor of our Lady, and beleeued that Christ had a body not solide, nor palpable, and that made the Images of God the father, and the holy Ghost, and worshipped the crosse, and thought they could doe some good worke without grace: which heresies notwithstanding are common to diuers Monkes and Friars now by Papists honoured, and called vpon as great Saints.

Anselme, Thomas Becket, and Edmond of Abindon, all Archbishops of Canterbury are canonized by the Pope, and agnized for saints by the Papists: yet were they disloiall and traitorous subiects to their Princes, and enemies of their countrie. Anselme being expressely forbidden by the King of England, to appeale to Rome, refused to obey. Afterward the same man fled the country without the kings licence, and sought by all meanes to trouble his king and country.

Thomas Becket stubburnely resisted the King, and the state, and denied that Clergy men committing murder and felonie were to be iusticed by the kings lawes. Which in effect is as much, as if he should deny Masse-priests and religious orders, and other Clergy men to be the kings subiects. When he could resist no more, he departed out of the countrie, and indeuored by all meanes to stirre vp both the Pope, and the French King against his soueregne Lord; which no man, that vnderstandeth law, can deny to be an act of treason. In summe, so little were his doings pleasing to good men, that as Heisterbach saith, it was disputed in Paris, that he was a damned person. Dying he vttered words, which could not proceed from a Martyr. For he commended not his spirit to God, as Martyrs did, but commended himselfe and the cause of the church to God, and our Lady, and the Saints of Canterbury church, and Saint Denys.

Edmund of Abindon after long contention with the king went out of the land malecontent, and complained of him to the Pope, in the end he died in France among the Kings enemies.

Richard

Richard Scrope Archbishop of Yorke toke armes against King Henry the fourth, and was therefore adiudged a traytor, and accordingly executed. Yet was he by the Popish faction adiudged a saint, and order giuen by the Pope to excommunicate all those, that put him to death.

Thomas of Lancaster likewise, in the daies of Edward the second king of England, rebelled, and stod in the field against his soueraigne Lord; yet whosoeuer list to examine the Popes calendars, shall there finde him registred for a saint. albeit we find not, that he professed any religion.

In the daies of Henry the eight King of England those were accompted most holy, that shewed themselues most obstinate in oppugning the kings authority, and defending the Popes supremacy.

Thomas More and Iohn Fisher, are reputed Martyrs. Yet was the cause of their death the defence of Antichrists kingdome, against the lawfull authority of the Prince.

In this role of the Popes Martyrs we finde also Friar Forest, and certaine seditious Monkes, that by a practise with the holy maid of Kent, as she was called, went about to stirre the kings subiects to rebellion. Hereunto may be added the seditious Priests, Monkes, Friars, and their complices in Yorkeshire and Lincolneshire, that were in open rebellion against the king, and were therefore executed according to the lawes of the Realme. All of them are esteemed by the Popish faction for no lesse then Martyrs.

In our late Queenes time principall rebels are accompted either Martyrs or Confessors, as the Nortons, Plomptre, Markenfeld, and diuers others. Sanders in his booke of the visible monarchy of the church calleth this Northren rebellion a confession of faith. He is also made a Martyr, for that he made a confession of faith in armes, and died in the act of rebellion in Ireland.

Of Campian, Sherwin, Briant, Kirby, Cottam, Richardson, Ford, Shert, and others executed as traitours for maintaining the Popes cause against the Queene, they make no question, but they died as Martyrs. For they pray

to

to them, and keepe their bones and rags for holy reliques, and worship them. Yet it is euident, that the intention of the Pope in sending them, was to make a side to put his bull in execution against Quæne Elizabeth: and that did Campian and Parsons well know, who obteined a faculty, that the same bull might not bind the Papists, matters standing, as then they did. Campian being demanded his opinion of the Popes bull, whereby the Quæne stod deposed, would by no meanes condemne it. Cottam openly professed, that he held with the Romish church in al things, and namely concerning the Popes bull, and the deposing of the Quæne. None of them would once promise to take the Quænes part, if an army should be sent against her by the Pope. But in Rome all that will not take the Popes part, or shall take him to be no Pope, are adiudged traytors. Neither doth the king of Spaine repute them loyall subiects, that shall refuse to take his part against any forreine inuador whatsoeuer.

Cardinall Allen, and Parsons, that anno 1588. set forward the Spanish armada, and in the meane while published a most infamous libell against the Quæne, are in the number of Confessors. Parry, Ballard, Babington, Somervil and others, that attempted against the life of the Quæne, are rubricated Martyrs.

Such Martyrs as these, were Iames Clement, that murdred his dread soueraigne King Henry the third of France, his confessor Bourgoin a Dominican Friar, and other his complices. Neither may Chastell, that attempted to murder King Henry the fourth, and Guincard the Iebusite, that allowed such murders, be left out. As for the Duke of Guise, and his brother the Cardinall, they are not onely Martyrs, but also marble pillers of the Synagogue of Rome.

Finally, we are not to maruell, if these inferior members of Antichrists kingdome haue bene allowed in their treasons and rebellions, and reputed Martyrs and Confessors for it, seeing the Popes of Rome, whom they accompt most holy, haue proued such notorious traitors against their Lords and maisters the Emperors of Rome. Siluerius was charged

charged with practising with the Gothes, and betraying the city of Rome to strangers, and for that cause condemned. Gregory the 2. and third, defied the Emperor, and drew the greatest part of Italy into open rebllion against him. Gregory the seventh did stirre vp the Emperors subiects against him. Pascal the second caused not only the subiects, but also the Emperors sonnes to rebell against him. And this quarrell hath bene so long pursued by other Popes, that the Emperor being brought vnder by the Pope, and Christendome being diuided in it selfe, the Turke hath preuailed against Christians, and the rest haue bene made subiect to Antichrist. All these good fellowes notwithstanding, that haue most stirred against the Emperors, are compted holy confessors, and saints by the Romanists. By this also it appeareth, that the Popes canonize wicked men, and that their complices imagine them to be saints in heauen, that are tormented with the diuels in hell. Gregory the seuenth was a murderer, a magician, empoysoner, and an impious fellow, and for such a one was condemned by the councell at Brixina, and Wormes. Such also were the rest of the traytors before mentioned. To declare the impieties, and foule facts of Parsons, Campian, Sanders, Allen, Watson, Guy Faux & the rest, it would require a large volume. By that which the secular Priests haue written against Parsons, and other Iebusites, we may esteeme of the rest. Boccace in his first nouell declareth, how one Sir Chappelet, a most wicked Italian vsurer, and coſiner came to be worshipped as a saint in France. And not long since a Friar called De Cornibus dying of the French disease, was worshipped as a Cherubicall saint in Paris, and so iudged by reason of his redneſſe proceeding of his fiery disease. Such are the impostures of this wicked generation. In the legend it appeareth, that they worship Saint Thais a publike strumpet, and 7. holy theeues. They say they were conuerted. But how doth that appeare?

To conclude this discourse, if Romish Martyrs were not heretikes, nor traitors, nor wicked men; yet haue the Papists no assurance of their Christian faith. Saint Edward the

Martyr is worshipped commonly by the Popish faction. So likewise is Elphege, and Becket. Yet no man can say, they either died for the Christian faith, or truly professed it. Nay, it is very uncertein, whether they professed any rule of faith, or not. For there remaineth no record thereof. If they alledge miracles, it will be answered, that Antichrist, and the Diuell himselfe are great workers of signes and miracles. Lanfranke doubted of the sanctity of Elphege, that was slaine in a quarrell about the Danes tribute, as we may read in the Legend of Anselme, and Anselme doth most foolishly resolue him. For he will haue them to be Martyrs, that died for iustice.

Now if we should grant, that 11000. virgins were slaine by the Hunnes; yet no man can say, that any of them was slaine for confessing Christ. For there is no proofe of any act of their confession. Nay it appeareth not what the faith was of S. Vrsula.

Finally in the Legends we reade of many Monkes, Friars, and others reputed saints and Martyrs; and yet finde no euidence to proue them true Christians. What true Christian then lamenteth not the miserable case of Papists, that not onely erre in the forme of Gods worship, ioyning saints in fellowship with God, and imparting to them the office of Christ Iesus, but also in their iudgement concerning saints and Martyrs, esteeming them for saints in heauen, that are by all likelihood adiudged to eternall paines with the Diuell in hell?

CHAP. VIII.

That the Papists doe oftentimes worship counterfet, and falfe reliques of saints.

IF then simple people haue bene so grossely deluded in the saints themselues: we neede not to wonder, if they haue bene pitifully abused in the reliques of saints. The particulars of them are innumerable. Gregory in his 3. booke epist. 30. ad Constantiam, testifieth, that certaine Greekes were taken

taken digging vp mens bones in a church-yard at Rome, and how they ment to cary them for Saints reliques into their country. Neither are we to doubt, but that far greater abuses are committed by the Romanists. For if that be true, which Gregory affirmeth in that epistle, that it was accompted an haynous offence to touch the bodies of saints, who may beleeue, that those armes, legges, heades and other parts of saints bodies, that are shewed in diuers places belonged to those Martyrs, of whom they are called?

A certeine crucifixe of wood in Mantua sweat blood, the which by Leo the 3. was adiudged to be the blood of Christ, which was shed for our redemption, as Baptist of Mantua testifieth in these verses:

Et quæ purpurea sanguis faciebat in horas
Mira opera intuitus, credi debere putauit
Effusum nostra pro libertate cruorem.

Now who is so blockish, that he cannot distinguish betwixt Christ and an idole, betwixt his true blood, and this counterfet blood? And who discerneth not, that this was a meere imposture of cunning Masse-priests?

In England also a phiole full of blood was shewed, which was pretended to be the blood of Christ, and called the blood of Hales. But vpon examination of the kepers, and diligent view of the blood it selfe, it was found to be the blood of a duck. Yet was the same worshipped by many simple people for many yeares together, for Christs most pretious blood.

If all the peeces and fragments, which are pretended to be taken from the crosse of Christ, vpon which he was crucified, were brought together, it is probably thought, they would load 3. or 4. cartes. Yet Christs crosse was not so great, but that one man might well beare it, as we reade in the Gospell. Doth it not then appeare, that many giue Latria to peeces of wood, that neuer belonged to the crosse; which worship notwithstanding is due only vnto God?

Likewise the Papists shew more nailes, and thornes, and speares, and sponges, then euer could be employed in the crucifying of Christ. This therefore might shew, if men were

not altogether blind, that the most part of these reliques are counterfet, and the rest very doubtfull.

In diuers places they shew the milke, the haire, and garments of the blessed Virgin. But how can milke be preserued so many ages? Againe, suppose haire and milke could so long be preserued, how can Parsons, or his consorts proue, that this is our ladies milke and haire, that is shewed commonly? As for her garments, that are shewed in the church of Lateran at Rome, any man that seeth them, if he haue any iudgement, may perceiue them to be counterfet. For they are made of the Italian fashion, and are of such stuffe, as that holy maiden neuer wore.

At Loreto in Italy they shew the house, wherein the Virgin Mary dwelt, and wherein our Sauior, as they say, was conceiued. This house they faine to haue beene transported by the ministery of Angels first from Galiley into Dalmatia, and then from thence, into Italy, to a place not farre from Recineto, and lastly to Loreto. *Hæc ades &c. ad gratiam cælitum reginæ à fundamentis auulsa est*, saith Horatius Tursellinus Lauret. hist. lib. 1. c. 2. *atque haud dubio angelorum ministerio inde vsq; à Galilæa (mirum dictu auditúq;) per ingentes terrarum marisq; tractus in Dalmatiam translata.* Afterward he sheweth, how the same was againe remoued and brought to Loreto. And how, trow you, is this proued? forsooth by a dreame. Our Lady appeared to a Priest at Tersactum (note the imposture of this Masse-priest) and shewed him that this was her house. *Sic habeto*, saith our Lady, apud Tursellinum lib. 1. hist. Lauret. c. 3. *sacram ædem vestris nuper illatam finibus, illam ipsam esse domum, vbi ego olim eram genita, vbi fermè educata sim. Hic ego Archangeli Gabrielis nuntio spiritus sancti opera diuinam concepi sobolem.* Now who abhorreth not to heare such mad and foolish tales told so sadly, and Christian people so deluded, that they beleeue them?

At Rome they shew the manger where our Sauiour Christ was laid, the hay that lay in the manger, the swadling cloutes wherein he was wrapped, the pillar whereto he was tied, when he was scourged, a certaine ladder where he

he is ſaid to breake his ſhinnes, when he was led blindfold. and diuers other ſuch deuices. But neither doe the Papiſts bring proofe, that theſe are the things, for which they paſſe, nor can any Chriſtian beléeue them to be the ſame, conſidering the newneſſe and faſhion of them. Beſide that, it may be a queſtion, how theſe things firſt came to Rome, and how the City being ſo oft deſtroied, they could be kept ſo ſafelie.

In S. Peters Church at Rome they ſhew the image of our Sauiours face, which he printed, as they ſay, in a napkin, as he wiped his face, and deliuered as a memoriall to Veronica. But any man, that is not blind, may ſée, that the face is fairely painted, and that not long ſince; albeit the ſame is ſhewed in a darke corner by torch light. My ſelfe being preſent at the ſhewing of it, did very well diſcerne the impoſture.

In the 119. Legend of the Lombardicall hiſtory we read, that a certaine deuout fellow, and a great louer of S. Auguſtine worſhipped a falſe finger, ſuppoſed to belong to S. Auſtine, giuen him by a Monke, or rather bought with a good ſumme of money. *Accepta pecunia*, ſaith Iames de Voragine, *digitum cuiuſdam mortui ſericis inuolutum ſibi tribuit.* Such falſe fingers alſo do conuey into mens hands many falſe reliques The body of S. Auguſtine is worſhipped alſo at Pauia. But how the ſame ſhould be conueied firſt out of Africke into Sardinia, and then from Sardinia to Genua, and ſo in the end to Pauia; will hardly be declared. And the rather, for that both Hippo and Sardinia, were ſpoiled, and waſted by barbarous nations.

In the Legend of S. Iohn Baptiſt nu. 80. we reade, that his tombe was ouerthrowen, and his bones burnt. *Oſſa ſancti Ioannis in Sebaſte ciuitate ab infidelibus combuſta fuerunt.* And this ſaith Beleth, is the reaſon, why at Midſommer Papiſts make bonefires. If then his bones were burnt or diſperſed, how happeneth it, that they are ſhewed at diuers places? his head is ſhewed at Rome, Amiens, and Poytiers. Two of theſe heads therefore neceſſarily muſt be counterfet.

S. Bartholomewes body was put into a leaden chest, and cast into the sea. How then came it into Sicily? Further the Legend saith, that the Saracens broke his tombe, and dispersed his bones. *Sepulchrum eius confringentes ossa eius dispersérunt.* This sheweth, that his body is not all in one place together. And yet as if he had two bodies, they shew the body of Bartholomew both at Rome, and Beneuentum, the which is testified by tradition legend. 118.

At Placentia they shew the reliques of Iustina and Cyprian, as appeareth by the 137. Legend. But how they came thither from Antioch, there is not any appearance. Nay it is said, that their bodies after their martyrdome were cast seauen daies to the dogges; and great doubt there is, whether euer there were any Cyprian, that is said to be a Magician, and in loue with Iustina, or no.

The body of Vincentius was cast into the sea, as they say, with a milstone about his necke. Let vs therefore vnderstand how the same commeth to be shewed at land. The Legend saith, that the body came with the milstone swimming aboue the water, and was taken vp by a certaine woman. But if Papists will worship Vincentius his true body, they must name vs this woman, and prooue vs this swimming of milstones, and that the body now shewed is indéed the body of Vincentius. If not, it may be iustly suspected, that these reliques are counterfet, and that for a Martyr, they worship the body of some Pagan, or Infidell.

The body of S. Quintin, as we reade in the 155. Legend was found in a riuer fifty yeares after it was cast in there. The Papists therefore must proue, that neither the fish did eat his body, nor the water consume it, nor that any other body is worshipped for that of S. Quintin: Or else it will be proued, that for a S. Quintin they worship some profane fiction, or stinking Monke or Friar.

The 165. Legend of the Lombardicall history telleth vs, how the body of Clement was found in a chappell vnder water three miles within the sea, and so caried to Rome. But vnlesse it bee proued, that Chappels be built in the sea, and

and that his body falling into the sea, encountred there with a tombe of marble, according as the legend saith, we may as well doubt of the truth of his reliques now worshipped at Rome, which dependeth on the credit of this Legend, as of this lying relation.

In Venice the body of S. Marke is worshipped with great solemnity. But Parsons for a thousand markes, if they were giuen him, cannot shew, how either that body came thither, or the Venetians may be assured, that the body there shewed is S. Markes body. In the Legend we reade, that certaine Venetians by promises and prayers obtained of two Priests, that they might take away his body. But neither the Priests, nor Venetians are named in any authenticall story. It is said also, that afterward the body being hidden in a marble pillar, and no man knowing where it was, the stones suddenly of themselues leaped out from the pillar: *lapides a columna prosiluut.* And so was the bodie discouered. But these are things forged, and very foolishly beléeued.

The reliques of S. Vitus a yong Saint are shewed both in Paris, and Saxony, as may appeare by the Roman Martyrologe, and by Baronius his Annotations vpon the 15. of June. The same reliques are also reported to be in diuers other places. But it will be hard to shew, how his body may be in diuers places at one time. Neither can the Papists alleadge any words for the same, as they alleadge Christs words for the being of his body in many places.

In the 64. Legend of the Lombardicall history, Seth the sonne of Adam is said to haue found out the crosse first, 200. and more yeares after Christs resurrection. But the proofe that is alledged, is the gospell of Nicodemus. The reliques therefore of the crosse must néeds be doubtfull, vnlesse the Papists will admit such Apocryphall tales to be true.

Boccace reporteth, that a certaine Friar made offer to shew a finger of the holy Ghost, and a feather out of the Angel Gabriels wing. But when a companion of his had taken away the feather, and put coales in the place, he made the

people beléeue, that those were the coales wherewith S. Laurence was rosted. Thus such impostors in time past deluded the credulous multitude. Cæsarius Heisterbach lib. 8. sheweth, how a deuout seruant of Thomas of Canterbury, built a Church in honour of a bridle, which he supposed to haue belonged to him. There also is declared, how that bridle, and diuers other counterfet reliques are shewed forth, for true reliques.

In France they worship a napkin, which they call S. Suaire, in stéd of Christs winding sheete, and yet they shew the same at Rome and diuers other places, as if Christ had béene lapped in many napkins and many winding sheets.

The body of Matthias, is shewed at Rome. *Huius corpus*, saith the Legend, *in ecclesia sanctæ* Mariæ maioris *sub lapide porphyretico sepultum esse dicitur.* And yet the same body is shewed at Treues, and in other places.

In the 84. legend we read, that S. Pauls head was found among many other mens heads. If then the Papists mistooke one for another, or else haue lost the true head; then do they percase for the head of some Apostle, worship the head of some Pagan.

In Flanders they worship the crosse, whereupon one of the théeues crucified together with Christ was hanged. Let Christians then iudge what a relique this is; and what Christians they are, that worship a théefes gibbet.

Finally the Lombardicall Legend it selfe leg. 112. confesseth, that there are many martyrologicall narrations, that are not authenticall. But vpon them the truth of many reliques dependeth.

CHAP. IX.

That the Legends of Saints are full of lies and fooleries.

STrange it is, that Parsons should giue any occasion to Christians, to looke into the martyrologies and legends of Saints.

Saints. For what, I beseech you, is more full of lies and foleries? But this is the iust iudgement of God, that such wicked fellowes should giue men occasion to publish their frauds and foleries, and that themselues should reueale their owne shame, and the nakednesse of the great whore.

In the legend of S. Iames in number the 94. it is said, that a Marchant being spoiled, and put in prison by a tyrant, did call deuoutly vpon S. Iames, who failed not to helpe him. For being shut within a high tower, the same bowed * it selfe so low, that it was made equall to the ground, by which meanes the man got out and escaped. *Turris se adeo inclinauit, quod ipsius summitas terræ æqualis fuit.* It is said also, that those which pursued him, albeit they were hard by him, could not see him. *Licet iuxta eum pergerent, tamen eum videre non poterant.*

* *Note how a high tower stooped and bowed it selfe.*

The body of S. Bartholomew being enclosed in lead, and throwne into the sea in India is said to haue sailed all along, and to haue come to Lipara. *In loculo plumbeo positum,* saith the legend, *in mare præcipitarunt, quod diuino nutu ad insulam prædictam (scilicet Liparam) deuenit.* The Indians inquiring of the diuell, what manner of man Saint Bartholomew should be, answered, that he was friend to the Almighty God. *& dæmon, amicus est Dei omnipotentis.* And doe Christians beléeue, that towers bended to the earth, and that the Apostles were approued by the diuels testimony?

The men of Silena in Lybia, as we reade in the Legend of S. George, being much troubled with a dragon, grew to composition with him for 2. sheep first, and then for one sheape and a man a day. This was, as it séemeth, when beasts spoke, and had reason. And so néere were they driuen, that the kings daughter must goe séede the dragon. A dragon as the legend saith, that kept in a lake as great as the sea. For it was both a fish dragon, and a flying dragon. But Saint George cast him downe to the ground, and afterward caused the mayden to lead him in a string. So he made of this wild dragon a tame beast. But Datianus, a king, but of what land, God knoweth, put him to diuers torments for the profession of Christ.

Christ; and among other this was one, that he put him into a frying panne full of boiling lead. But this paine, was to him such a refreshment, as if he had bene in a bath. And with such lying fables is that legend fraught, and Christians deluded.

In the Legend of Sylvester they tell vs, how Constantine the Great was a persecutor of the church, and how for that cause he was stricken with leprosie. But these are matters contrary to all stories. They say also, that his Physicians counselled him, to bathe himselfe in the blood of yong children. But that is contrary to Physicke. Further they tell vs, that Peter and Paul appeared to Constantine, and that Silvester shewed him their Images. The first of which points is contrary to religion, which teacheth vs, that soules departing, rest from their labours: the second is contrary to the practise of the church. For then Bishops had no vse of Images. And yet these are not all the absurdities of this legend. For therein we reade further, that Helene brought 149. Doctors to dispute against Christian religion, whereas all good authors report, that she was a Christian, and an instructer of her sonne in Christian religion. It is said also, that a Iew killing a bull with speaking a word in his eare, Silvester restored him againe to life, and that he bound vp a dragons mouth with a thread, and sealed it with the signe of the crosse. Belike it was either a weake dragon, or a strong thread.

The father of Saint Barbara, as Iames de Voragine assureth vs leg. Lomb. 188. was so much offended with her, seeing that she was become a Christian, that he drew out his sword and thought to kill her. But see, I pray you, what followed. She prayed, and her father thinking to strike his daughter missed her, and stroke the rocke where she stood, asunder, and so she was receiued within the rocke, and cast out vpon another mountaine not farre off, where two shepheards kept sheepe. *Abscissa est petra*, saith he, *& recepit eam intus, & eiecit eam super montem, in quo duo pastores erant pascentes oues suas.* Behold a cruell father, and a terrible stroke, and a strange escape.

But

But Dimpna was more cruelly vsed by her father, as saith Molanus in indiculo. For she being the King of Irelands daughter, and flying into Flanders, her owne father pursued her, and cut off her head. It may be a question, whether a King would depart out of his country for such a matter. But it is a farre greater doubt, what authority he had, to kill his owne daughter, and that in a strange country.

Iames de Voragine in the Legend vpon the finding of the crosse saith, it was made of 4. sorts of wood; to wit, of Palme, Cedre, Cypresse, and Oliue, and that the Apostle doth signifie so much, where he saith, that ye may comprehend what is the length, depth, breadth, and height. He sheweth also, that one Iudas a Iew shewed Helene, where the crosse lay hid, and how the diuell cried out vpon him for it. *Diabolus in aere, saith he, vociferabatur dicens, ô Iuda quid hoc feciſti?*

Saint Iustina with making the signe of the crosse made the diuell to melt like waxe, as is said in her drosly legend. *Mox signum crucis edidit, & instar ceræ diabolum liquefecit.* afterward being put into a frying panne full of pitch and war, presently the fire went out, and she felt no hurt. And if you will not beleeue this, then Iames de Voragine in his 137. Legend hath deceiued you with his Romish traditions.

A certaine Miller withstood Remigius demanding his right in the mill. But see the effect of a saints wrath. Presently the wheele of the mill turned backeward. *Statim Rota molendini in contrarium verti cœpit.* And when the Millar would haue diuided with him, he said, neither let it be mine, nor thine, and then the earth opened and swallowed vp the mill. *Et molendinum penitus deglutiuit.* You may imagine it went hard with the miller, if he were within it. But this is a tradition of the Romish cuckoldly religion.

Saint Margaret, as Petrus de Natalibus lib. 6. c. 120. telleth vs in good sadnes, was swallowed vp of the diuell in the forme of a dragon. But see the force of the signe of the crosse. She crossed, and the dragon burst, and she came forth of his side without hurt. So here is the ende of this one diuell. another time she toke the diuell by the haire of the head (note that

that the diuell here had haire, and a head) and cast him downe vnder her, and set her right foote vpon his necke. *diabolum*, saith he, *per capillos apprehendit, & sub se ad terram deiecit, ac super cervicem eius dextrum pedem posuit.*

The same man lib. 2. de sanct. c. 6. telleth vs, how Saint Martine could neither be hurt with fire, nor with pitch, nor with wild beasts. He was put into a boyling frying-pan, but was comforted with heauenly dew. *In frixorio accenso mittitur, sed cœlesti rore refrigeratur.* When he was cast to wilde beasts, a leopard licked his feete, and a tigre kissed his hand. But a Lioneſſe and a Beare being more bold, began to teare his cloathes; but they died for it presently. *Leæna & vrsus qui vestes sancti dilaniare cœperunt, statim extincti sunt.*

A certaine leud fellow had stollen a sheepe, but was not knowen to the owner. But Saint Patricke, as it is said legend. 49. commanded the sheep to bleat out of the theues belly, and to bewray the stealth.

In Saint Hieromes legend in number 141. we reade, how a Lyon came to his cell, complaining of a hurt in his foote, and how being cured he remained tame with him, and was set to keepe an Asse. But see the euill hap of this Asse. while the Lyon slept, the asse was taken away. And then was the Lion most sorowfull, and did penance bearing home wood like an Asse, vntill such time, he had found his fellowe Asse againe. And if you beleeue not this, take heede, you be not burnt for heretikes.

A certaine deuout seruant of Cosmas and Damianus had a canker in his legge. But they two in his sleepe cut off the cankred legge, and in the place thereof put a Moores legge, and so cured him. Neither doth Iames de Voragine doubt of this matter.

In the Legend of Agathon in number the 175. we read, that a certaine Monke heard this voice, thou and thy Asse be all one. And of this percase it commeth, that Monkes and Friers in bearing the Popes burdens are such asses.

When Saint Adelphus his body passed by, as we reade in

in the 181. legend, the wood of Vosagus did bow it selfe vnto it. *Silua Vosagi se coram corpore Adelphi inclinauit.* Behold a pong and flexible wood.

Iodocus although now dead, yet hath haire growing as he lieth in his graue continually. And that is the reason, why he is shauen euery Saturday. *Radebatur barba Iodoco*, saith the legend, *omni sabbato.*

The diuell entring very saucily into S. Genouefua, as we reade leg. Lomb. 213. was conueied out of her, as sluttishly. For she cast him forth into her close stole. *daemon fluxu ventris eiectus est.*

Petrus de Natalibus lib. 8. de sanct. c. 20. telleth vs, how Lupus perceiuing the diuell to be crept into a vessell of water, cast a cushion vpon it, and kept him fast in. *Puluinar super os vasis posuit, & diabolum intus clausit.* And how in the meane while, thinke you, did this poore diuell behaue himselfe? forsooth he houled all the night. *Tota nocte vlulauit.* He was of neere kinred belike to Houler, aliàs Parsons.

In the legend of Quiricus and Iulitta, it is said, that Quiricus being holden in the presidents armes, bitte him by the shoulder. *præsidem in scapulis momordit.* And this because he would haue turned him from Christian religion.

A swarme of flies possessed a whole monastery. But after that S. Bernard had excommunicated them, they were found al dead, as is said in his Legend. It is said also, that he excommunicated the diuell, and all his company. Well had it beene with Monkes, if they had died also together with the flies.

After that the soule of the blessed virgin was departed from the body, as we finde in the legend of her assumption, the body spoke these words, *gratias tibi ago domine &c. egressa de corpore eius anima, hæc verba protulit corpus.* When the Apostles bore her body to buriall, it is said, that Peter began this Psalme, *In exitu Israel de Aegypto.* Was not this well applied trow you? *A body without a soule spoke.*

Euphrosyna wife of Eustasius, as we reade in Donatus his legend, spoke out of her graue. *& facta est vox de sepulchro.* And yet other women being dead are silent.

Dominicus.

Dominicus in his legend is said to haue asked, and learned of the diuell, in what thing he tempted his Friars. On a time also he saw a dragon, that went about to swallow them. Great pity it is, that other Friars see not the same. Petrus de Natalibus lib. 7. de sanctis. c. 22. saith, that his mother, while she bore him in her body, dreamed, that she had in her belly a dogge with a torch in his mouth, that set all the world on fire. Which if it were true, betokeneth the cruell and dogged nature of Friers, that set all the world on a flame with their seditious practises. When he died, Iesus and his mother are said by ladders to draw him vp to Heauen. His arguments against heretikes being cast into the fire, as is said, would not burne. But Parsons bookes of 3. conuersions are not of that nature.

Saint Francis, as we read in the booke of conformities, made peace betwixt the men of Eugubium, and a furious wolfe, condemning them in charges; and ordring, that the wolfe should doe no more harme. *Frater lupe*, said *Francis, tu facis multa damna.* And againe, *lupus leuauit dextrum pedem anteriorem. & blande posuit super manum B. Francisci, signo quo poterat fidem dans.* Lo heere the swearing, and promise of a wolfe. And againe, *si vos promittatis ei omni die dare expensas, & pro fratre lupo ego fide iubeo.* So Francis became surety for the wolfe. and the wolfe liuing afterward two yeares proued a good begging Frier, going from doore to doore asking meate.

Preaching to the swallowes he commanded them silence, and bid them heare the word of God. *Sorores mee hirundines* saith he, *audite verbum dei tenentes silentium.*

On a time also preaching at an oke full of antes, he commanded them to depart, and the people to giue them way. *Vt libere abirent, iussit populo vt locum darent sororibus formicis.*

A certaine woman making a noise, while he was preaching, and not ceasing, at his commandement was caried away by the Diuell in the aire, and neuer came more. He might doe well to doe the like to Parsons, that albeit he can say nothing to purpose, is euer talking.

When he was to preach before the Pope, he forgat his matter

matter. ſée a Frier perplexed. And yet ſaith the booke, he ſpoke excellently, and effectually.

Entring into a bote, that he might free himſelfe from the preaſe, the bote moued from the ſhore of it ſelfe, and ſtood immoueable in the water.

A certaine man in a trance ſaw ſaint Francis, and his company iſſuing out of Chriſts wound in his ſide. *De ipſius vulnere laterali exiuit B. Franciſcus.* But this was but a dreame, as it ſéemeth.

Bonauenture alſo writing Saint Francis his life, reporteth no leſſe ferly things of him. Firſt he telleth vs, that a voice comming from a crucifix, bid him repaire Chriſts church. So it appeareth, he had a wooden calling. He ſaith further, that a golden croſſe was ſeene iſſuing out of Saint Francis his mouth, whoſe top reached to the heauens, and the armes to the ends of the world, and that he was caried vp to Heauen in a firy Charet. But all this was but a feined dreame.

Lib. 1. c. 7. and 8. he telleth vs, how Francis found a dineli in a purſe full of mony, and that he curſed a hog in ſuch ſort, that he died.

Lib. 1. c. 13. He telleth vs, how the water wherein Francis had waſhed his hands, cured ſcabbed ſheepe, and ſicke oxen.

When one Bonelus would not beléeue, that a conſecrated hoſt was the true corpus domini, and alledged for himſelfe, that his aſſe would eate conſecrated hoſtes; Saint Antony the Frier preſented a conſecrated hoſt to the aſſe, and forth, with, ſaith the Legend, the aſſe fell on her knees, and bowing her head, did reuerence vnto it. *Statim aſina genua flexit, & capite inclinato reuerentiam exhibuit.* Many ſuch aſſes there be notwithſtanding in the world, which fall downe and worſhip this idole.

The wood of Saint Oſwalds croſſe, as Petrus de Natalibus lib. 7. c. 23. affirmeth, being put into water, and the water being drunken, helpeth both man and beaſt of all diſeaſes. *De ipſa cruce lignea fruſta concidentur,* ſaith he, *& in aquam mittuntur, cuius aquæ potus ſanitatem cuiuſcunque ægritudinis præſtat hominibus ac iumentis.*

S. Blaſius

Saint Blasius was a protector of beasts, as is said in the 38. Legend. and therefore he was fed by birds. And such an opinion they had of his holinesse, that they would not depart, vntill such time, as he had laid his hands vpon them, and blessed them. *Aues pabulum afferebant &c. & vsque dum imponeret manum eis benedicens, non recedebant ab eo.* It is marueil therefore that dottrels and wood-cockes bee no wiser, hauing Saint Blases benediction.

But no legends seeme more foolish, then those, which English Papists in time past approued. S. Aidus, as Capgraue telleth, feeding certaine lambs and sheepe, and hauing compassion vpon eight hungry wolues, gaue them eight of his lambes, which no doubt eat them sweetly, and without sauce. Afterward it is said, that fearing his nurses displeasure, he praied to haue his lambes againe, and so had them returned to him safe and sound, out of the wolues bellies.

A bucke being hardly pursued by hunters fled to him for succor, and kneeling before him praied his helpe. *Auxilium ab eo postulans coram eo genua flexit.* For beasts in those times knew well the sanctity of Romish saints. Hereupon it followed, saith the legend, that the Deare escaped.

Anselmus also, as we reade in his Legend, succoured a hare almost tired out, and so wrought, that the dogges could neither see her, nor hurt her. The same saint, seeing a child hauing a bird tied by the legge, wished that she might escape, and presently the thred broke, and away flew the bird. *Filum rumpitur, & auolat auis.* See I pray you a great wonder in breaking a thread. Sailing ouer in a ship, that had a planke sprung in the bottome, yet no drop of water could enter in, so long as Anselme was in her.

Saint Austen the Monke by prayer obteined, that certaine men of Dorset and all their posterity had tailes, because they mocked him, hanging fishes tailes at his backe. See a malitious saint. The same man throwing his staffe at a woman, that mocked him, out flew his staffe, like an arrow saith Capgraue, and out rose a fountaine, where it pitched.

The diuell, saith the Legend, vexed Saint Bartilmew the Monke

Monke very often turning himselfe now into a mouse, now into a lion, now into a bull, now into an ape, baiting him, and pulling him strangely. But how did he behaue himselfe, trow you, in the meane while? Forsooth he caught this diuell so fast, that he hurt him not. It is said also, that he saw the soule of Thomas Prior of Durrham caried by Angels into heauen, and a diuel standing in a corner with a face deformed that gaue out terrible cries. *Animam eius corpore exiuisse*, saith Capgraue, *vir dei Bartholomeus ab Angelis in Caelum ferri vidit. Vidit etiam diabolum in angulo propius assistere planctus miserabiles ore terribili & facie deformi edere. Vrsi quippe specie tum erat.* Certaine mariners gaue him a little ware. And this a certaine crow, as is said, caried for him into a certaine Iland, where he had appointed to bestow it. The same man also set a hauke to penance for deuouring him a little bird, which vsed to fetch meate from his table. for so saith Capgraue.

Of Saint Bernac he telleth things yet more incredible, as namely, that he yoked wild harts, and caused them to draw home his carts; that he caused a wolfe to keepe his cow, and so wrought, that his cow being stollen, killed, cut in peeces, and put to boiling in a caldron, neither would the fire burne vnder it, nor the water ware hot. Nay it is said, that he restored his cowe all cut to peeces, to life againe.

Saint Brendan, when he wanted milke, caused a wild hind to descend from the mountaine, and to giue him milke. A poore man being hardly pursued by his enemies, and crying for helpe, Brendan bad him get vp vpon a great stone hard by. Which being done his enemies take him for the stone, and the stone for him, and so after the stone had beene soundly beaten, the man escaped without any hurt. it is said also, that he wrote the rule of his order out of the mouth of an Angell. *Ex ore angeli*, saith Capgraue, *scripsit sanctam regulam.* He telleth also, how entring into a ship with one Barnitus, he sailed into paradise. He is, as it seemeth, the first man, that went into paradise by water. He telleth further, how he sailed by *Limbus Patrum*, Purgatory, and hell. Strange it was, that the water being so neere the fire of

Purgatory, quenched not out the flame. With one praier he draue out, as is said, all the fleas in Elioch. If he could haue driuen out al the lice out of Friars breeches, they should haue bene all much bound to worship him.

S. Brigit, as is reported, caused a little child to tell who was his father. And yet the great lowbaby Parsons cannot tell, who was his father. She caused also a riuer to passe from one place to another, as is conteined in a certaine Romish tradition. *Flumen quoddam de loco suo ad alterum locum mutauit.* It is said also, that she changed stones into salt, and water into beere. It would haue bene said wine, but that they thought good to leaue that priuiledge to Christ.

Of S. Cutbert they tell, that certaine Friars comming to visite him could haue no faire weather, vntill such time, as they had eaten a goose, which he gaue them. You will, perchase, say, what is a goose to faire weather? but we must report our selues for that to the goselike authour of the legend. His body, they say, rested many yeares vnputrified. And needs it must be so, for that as they giue out, he appeared diuers yeares after to king Alphred.

S. Dunstane, as Capgraue telleth vs, had diuers combats with the Diuell. At one time the Diuell looking in where he was working a peece of iron, (for it should seeme he had some skill in the blacke smiths art) he tooke him by the nose with a paire of fire tonges, and there held him. At another time being to consecrate a Church, and perceiuing, that the same stood not right East and West, he put his shoulder to it, and set it right as it should stand. And so perfectly was he sighted, that he saw with his corporall eies our Lady and diuers quiers of Virgins. He heard them also sing songs. Finally his harp hanging on the wall sounded out an antheme, although no man touched it. For all this is recorded in the Romish traditionary Legends.

Robert Brocke curtald and deformed Thomas Beckets riding beast. but Capgraue sheweth, that he was worthily punished for it. For after that, his dogges refused to take meat at his hands. May so farre was the said Becket in our Ladies

fauour

fauour, that it is said, she mended his haire shirt, and stitched it with red silke. But why, trow you, with red silke, rather then blew or browne?

Of Wolstane, Capgraue reporteth, that he did wrastle with the Diuell, and fairely cast him thrise. *Demonem ter completens prostrauit* saith he. So it appeareth, though he were not learned, that he was yet a good wrastler. It is said also, that he had a faculty in curing of gheit and blind men. For whereas one was cut by his enemies, and had his eies pulled out, he healed him, and put him in new, and better eies, then he had before. *Nouas & modicas*, saith Capgraue, *in fossarum profunditate pupillas, tanquam duas posuit prunulas, & quas varias habuit ex natura, nigras recepit ex gratia.*

It were infinite to relate all the lies and foleries conteined in Romish Legends. Neither is it greatly needfull, seeing that by these few examples, the folery and vanity of the worship of Saints confirmed by them may euidently be conuinced.

CHAP. X.

That S. Peter, *and other Apostles, and Martyrs, and holy men of ancient times, albeit registred in the* Roman *Calendars and Martyrologies, yet were no way acquainted with that faith, or worship of God, or Saints, and that Popish tyranny, which the Church of England now refuseth.*

The scope and intention of Parsons in his Calendars, and whole discourse of their conuersions, albeit inuolued in a masse of idle words, appeareth to be this: first to returne his countriemen, and to bring them backe vnto the Ægyptian bondage of his Romish Pharao; and next to worke in them a liking of the worship of Saints practised in the Romish Church. For to that end he telleth vs how much we are be-

holding to Rome for our conuersion to Christian religion, and setteth downe the Apostles, Martyrs and ancient Doctors and holy men in his Calendar, as if all they had beene of the moderne Romish religion. Wherefore as before we haue answered his blundring discourse of these conuersions; so now it will be necessary to shew, how little the Apostles and primitiue Martyrs, and Doctors make for him, and that the Romish worship and inuocation of Saints is impious, and repugnant both to Scriptures, and to the practise of the ancient Church.

That the holy Apostles, and ancient Martyrs, and Doctors of the primitiue church were not acquainted with that faith and worship of God, or Saints, or with that authority and regiment Ecclesiasticall, which the church of Rome and Pope now practiseth, and the Church of England refuseth; these particulars among many others may declare vnto vs, and assure all indifferent men.

1 First the Romish church teacheth, that the holy canonicall Scriptures are insufficient, and no perfect rule of faith. This is collected out of the decrees of the Doctours of Trent, that adde traditions to canonicall Scriptures: and is openly professed by some of our aduersaries. The bishop of Eureux hath published a Treatise of the insufficiency of Scriptures, albeit some say he is now ashamed of it. And Bellar. lib. 4. de verb. dei. c 4. offereth to prone, that Scriptures without traditions are neither simply necessary, nor sufficient. He saith further, that Scriptures are but a part of the rule. But S. Paul a calendred Saint saith, that Scriptures are able to make the man of God perfect, and wise to saluation. For so we reade 2. Tim. 3. This is also the doctrine of S. Augustine lib. 2. de doctr. Christ. c. 9. where he saith, that all things necessarily belonging to faith and manners are conteined in plaine places of Scriptures. Neither may we thinke, that either any Apostle, or holy father taught otherwise.

2 That Church doth with equal affection embrace vnwritten traditions, and the word of God written, as in the fourth Session of the conuenticle of Trent is plainly declared. But neither

neither the Apostles, nor the ancient fathers did euer hold any doctrine beside scriptures, and not conteined in them to be equall to scriptures. Nor did the people of God vnder the Law giue like credit to traditions, and to the Law of God deliuered to them by Moyses. Nay oftentimes our Sauiour Christ doth speake against the traditions of the Scribes and Pharisies. And Saint Peter 2 epist. 1. sheweth that the word of the Prophets, is more firme, then a Reuelation from heauen. For hauing spoken of a Reuelation, he addeth these words, *Habemus firmiorem Propheticum sermonem.* This is also proued by reason. For traditions depending vpon Popish decretales, and lying Legends, it must needes follow, if tradition be equall to scriptures, that the Popes decretales and legends are also equall to the holy canonicall scriptures: which is a matter most absurd.

3 The synagogue of Rome beleeueth the bookes of Iudith, Tobiah, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdome and the Machabees to be canonicall scriptures, and of equall authority with the rest. But the Apostles neuer alledge them, and the Fathers expressely exclude them out of the canon, as namely Hierom in prolog. Galeato. and in his preface on the Prouerbs, Athanasius in synopsi, Gregory Nazianzen in his verses, Epiphanius de mensur. & ponderib. and diuers others. And Augustine, albeit not being skilful in the Hebrew, he doth number them with other scriptures; yet doth he not say they are equall to them.

4 Neuer did the Apostles or ancient fathers detract from scriptures, or speake euill of them. For that is a property of heretikes, as Ireneus lib. 3. c. 2. saith: when they are conuinced by scriptures they begin to fall into dislike of them, and to accuse them. But the Papists accuse them of obscurity, and insufficiency, and call them a nose of wax, a matter of strife, and a dead and killing letter.

5 They neuer did prohibit scriptures to be read publikely, or priuatly without licence. Nay our Sauior exhorted his followers to search the scriptures, and the Apostle Paul admonished his scholar, attentiuely to reade them, and calleth

Gods word the sword of the spirit; which sheweth, that these armes are common to all Christians. The Maisters therefore of the Romish synagogue, that fray the vulgar sort from reading scriptures, and prohibit them to be read publikly in tongues vnderstood of the vulgar sort, digresse from their doctrine and manners.

6 They neuer thought the Latine vulgar edition of the Bible to be authenticall, but in matter of doubt had recourse alwaies to the Originall text, as may appeare by the testimony of Hierom in epist. ad Suniam & Fretelam, and of Augustine lib. 2. de doctr. Christ. c. 10. The Romish Pharisaicall Doctors therefore doe dissent from the Apostles and Fathers, and saints of former times.

7 The ancient Fathers condemne the legends of S. George, Quiricus, and Iulitta, and diuers others, as may appeare by the chapter sancta Romana. dist. 15. The Romanists not only allow them, and defend them, but also adde others vnto them of lesse probability.

8 The Apostle teacheth vs Rom. 10. that faith commeth of hearing, & hearing of the word of God. But Tho. Aquin. in opusc. cont. errores Græcor. saith, that it is a matter of faith, to beleeue the determinatiõ of the Pope. *Ad fidem pertinet*, saith he, *inhærere determinationi pontificis summi in his quæ sunt fidei, imò & in his, quæ spectant ad bonos mores.* Likewise Syluester Prierius in summa verb. Fides. *Ad fidem pertinent omnia, quæ sunt in doctrina ecclesiæ.* that is, all things belong to faith, which are taught by the Church. And this is the doctrine of their followers.

9 The Apostles and ancient Martyrs of the church knew no head, nor spouse of the Catholike Church, beside Christ Iesus, according to the words of the Apostle Eph. 5. Christ is the head of the church, and he is the Sauiour of his body. There also he sheweth, how neere Christ is ioined to his Church. Cyprian de vnitat. ecclesiæ calleth the church Christs spouse. But the Pope c. inter Corporalia. de translat. episc. & c. quoniam. de immunit. ecclesiæ, calleth the Church his spouse, and commonly the Pope is called by his followers, the

the head of the church. Bellarmine lib. 2. de pontif. Rom. c. 31. giueth the title of head and spouse of the Church, to the Pope.

Saint Paul 1. Cor. 3. teacheth vs, that no man can lay any other foundation, but that which is laid, which is Christ Iesus. And vpon him he saith, the faithfull are built, as vpon a chiefe corner stone. And this was the sole anchor hold of the ancient Martyrs faith, as appeareth by their confessions, and by the words of Athanasius in synopsi. But among the Papists the Pope is the foundation of the church, and all in all. Sanders calleth him a rocke, and Bellarmine in præfat. in lib. de pontif. Rom. teacheth, that Peters seat is the approued, angular, and pretious stone, that is placed in the foundation. 10

Saint Iames teacheth vs Chap. 4. that we haue but one Law-giuer and Iudge, that can saue and destroy. And this al the fathers and holy Martyrs beleeued, relying wholy and soly in time past vpon the determination of Christ Iesus Iudge of quicke and dead. But the Romanists hold, that the Pope saueth by his indulgences, bindeth mens soules with his lawes, and destroieth with his Anathematismes, and curses. 11

Both Christs Apostles, and the ancient Martyrs, and fathers of the church, beleeued, that Christs body is visible and locall. Augustine de essentia diuinit. saith, that Christ according to his humane nature is visible, corporeall, and locall. Theodoret dial. 2. saith, that now Christs body reteineth his former forme, figure and circumscription. And so * Fulgentius holdeth. If the body of Christ, saith he, be a true body, then may it be conteined in a place. The faith then of the Apostles and holy fathers maketh not for the Papists, that beleeue that Christs true body is in the sacrament, albeit the same be not there visible, nor circumscriptible, nor so conteined, but that it is also in infinit other places. 12

* *Ad Thrasim. lib. 2.*

They in times past taught, that Christs body being on earth was not in heauen, and now being in heauen is not on earth. For these are the words formally conteined in the writings of Vigilius lib. 4. contr. Eutychen. This holy 13

Father therefore held not the faith of the Romanists, nor believed that Christs true body is both in heauen and on earth, and in euery consecrated host at one time.

14 Our Sauior Christ, Ioh. 6. refuteth the Capernaites, that beleeued, that his flesh was to be eaten with the teeth, & that his blod was to be received into the throte. And this doctrine of his the Apostles embraced, refusing all Cyclopicall eating of mans flesh and drinking of mans blod. Saint Augustine tract. 25. in Ioan. sheweth, that Christ is not to be laid hold on with the teeth, and that his flesh is no meat for the belly, but for the vnderstanding. And this all the ancient fathers and Martyrs beleeued, that his flesh was to be eaten spiritually by faith, and not corporally and grossely with the bodily mouth. But Nicolas the second in the confession prescribed to Berengarius c. ego Berengarius. de consecrat. dist. 2. saith Christs body is handled with hands, torne with teeth and corporally eaten. *Credo* saith he, *panem & vinum, quæ in altari ponuntur, post consecrationem non solum sacramentum, sed etiam verum corpus & sanguinem domini nostri Iesu Christi esse, & sensualiter non solum sacramentum, sed in veritate manibus sacerdotum tractari, frangi & fidelium dentibus atteri.*

15 They neuer beleeued, that a mouse, or a dog, or a hog, or a reprobate man did eat Christs body. Saint Augustine saith, that Iudas did eate *panem domini*, not, *panem dominum*; that is the sacrament, and not Christs true body. These beleeue, that euery beast, or wicked man eating consecrated hostes, eateth Christs true body also.

16 They beleeued, that Christ was wounded for our iniquities, and broken for our sinnes, and that the discipline of our peace was vpon him. For so we read Isay 53. Further they doubted not, but that he hath reconciled vs to his father, and fully satisfied for our sinnes. But the synagogue of Rome teacheth, that euery Christian is to satisfie for the temporall paine of mortall sinnes cõmitted after baptisme, either here, or at the least in Purgatory, and that we are to wound our selues for our owne sinnes, and to make our owne peace our selues. They teach vs also, that indulgences for sinnes are

derived

derfued out of the superfluous merites of the saints, as well as out of the merites of Christ.

They beleeue that Christ Iesus is our only Aduocate to reconcile vs to his father, and that he is the only Mediatour betwixt God and man. for that is taught vs by Saint Iohn, 1. epist. 2. this by Saint Paul, 1. Tim. 2. Neither doe we reade, that any of the ancient Martyrs in their agony did inuocate Angels, or saints to helpe them, vnlesse we will beleeue coũterfet writings of the fathers. These fellowes, that beleeue the Popes doctrine, doe admit as many aduocates and mediators, as there be saints or Angels. They fly to them for helpe in all their necessities, and pray vnto them both publikely and priuatly; and albeit they say, they call vpon them as intercessors, yet the formes of their praiers doe hold them to be immediat giuers of good things. 17

The Apostles neuer taught vs to confesse our sinnes to Angels and saints, saying *confiteor deo omnipotenti, beatæ Mariæ semper virgini, beato Michaeli archangelo, B. Ioanni Baptistæ, Beatis Petro & Paulo &c.* Nor did they teach men to make vowes to Saints, or to sweare by saints or angels. Nay they did well vnderstand, that it is an honour due to God to make vowes vnto him, and to sweare by his holy name. The ancient fathers of the Church also did both teach and practise the same, as I haue at full declared in my bookes against Bellarmines disputes de cultu sanctorum. But all this doctrine and practise is altered, and changed by the Pharisaicall doctors of the Romish synagogue, who not only confesse their sinnes to Angels and saints, and sweare by them, and make vowes vnto them, as to demy Gods; but also lead other simple Christians into the same errors. 18

S. Peter would not suffer Cornelius to worship him. Neither did he euer weare triple crowne, or was borne vpon mens shoulders, or had a guard of Suitzars to attend on him, or gaue his feet to be kissed for a fauour to his followers. Furthermore we do not reade for many ages, that the auncient Bishops of Rome take on them this state, or that ancient Martyrs did allow any such matter in any bishop or prelate 19

of

of the Church. But now the maintenance of this pompe and state is cause of all the troubles and persecutions in Christendome, and for the same the Popes and their followers doe principally contend.

20 The Apostles and ancient Fathers neuer taught Christians, to make the images of the Trinity, or to giue Latria to the crosse and crucifixe, or to worship Saints and Images in that forme, which the Papists practise. Nay full well they knew, that the law of God that forbiddeth the making of any grauen Image, or likenesse, to the intent to bow downe to it, and worship it, is directly contrary to the same. Lactantius lib. 2. instit. diuin. c. 19. saith, there is no religion, where grauen Images are; which sheweth, that in his time Christians had no Images in their Churches. The same is also proued by the Apologies of diuers Fathers made for christian religion. Epiphanius hæres. 79. calleth the affection, which some had in making grauen Images, a diuelish indeuour. Herein therfore the Church of Rome hath all the ancient Fathers and Martyrs of the Church, that died rather then they would offer incense to grauen images, for parties.

21 The Scriptures teach vs, that euen the iust man falleth diuers times a day, and that we offend all in many things. And this is the doctrine of the holy Apostles, and ancient Fathers, and Martyrs. S. Hierome lib. 1. aduers. Pelag. saith, we are then iust, when we confesse our sinnes. And S. Augustine de spirit. & lit. teacheth, that then we shall performe the law of God with all our soule, and all our hart, and loue our neighbour as our selfe, when we shall see God face to face. But the Papists teach, that we are not onely able to performe the law of God perfectly, but also to doe more then is required of vs by the law.

22 S. Paul Galat. 2. teacheth, that no flesh is iustified by the workes of the law. And specifieth the same by the example of the father of the faithfull. And this all the ancient Fathers, and Martyrs beleeued, which loked for reconciliation by the bloud of Christ Iesus, and acknowledged themselues sinners. But now the Romish Scribes teach all contrary, and affirme

affirme that every Christian is iustified by his owne workes, and by the workes of the law.

The Prophet Abachuc doth shew, that the iust doe liue by faith; and this is likewise the doctrine of the Apostles of Christ, and Martyrs of the Church, and the hope of the faithfull, that relie on Christs merits. But the Papists teach, that charity is the forme of faith; as if true faith had no life, nor forme in it selfe, and as if Christians were to trust to their owne merits. 23

The Apostles and ancient Martyrs of the church knew nothing of the necessity of auricular confession, or of the Popish sacrament of confirmation, or extreme vnction. Nor did they beleeue, that either mariage, or orders, or penance was such a sacrament, as baptisme, or the Lords supper. But the conuenticle of Trent sess. 6. c. 1. doth anathematize all that beleeue not, that there are iust seuen Sacraments, and neither more nor lesse; and all of them instituted by Christ. 24

They never thought nor taught that Christians are iustified by extreme vnction, or mariage, or orders. But the Popish Doctors teach so, and curse all that shall say contrary. 25

They beleeued that Christ was so perfect a Mediator betwixt God and man, that he needed none to intercede, or mediate for him. But the Priests of the Romish church make themselues Mediators for Christs body and blood, as if they were not acceptable of themselues without their praiers and oblation, saying, *Supra quæ propitio, ac sereno vultu respicere digneris, & accepta habere &c.* 26

In their rituall bookes they pray, that the Font may be made fruitfull with the oile of saluation, to those that shall be regenerate by it to life. In baptisme also they vse salt, and spittle and light. But the Apostles and primitiue Martyrs neither called materiall oile, the oile of saluation, nor vsed any such praier, or ceremonies in the administration of this holy sacrament. 27

In their missals they consecrate holy water, and salt saying, *Exorcizo te creatura aqua*, and *exorcizo te creatura salis.* 28

But

But the Apostles and ancient Doctors of the church neither instituted, nor practised any such coniurations.

29 There also they consecrate paschall Lambes euery yeare, and alledge the example of Moyses, and the authority of the law. But all Christians know, that the ceremoniall law is ceased, and that Christ our paschal Lambe is already offered vp, as the Apostle 1. Cor. 5. teacheth.

30 The conuenticle of Florence in their instruction to the Armenians teach, that these words, I signe thee with the signe of the crosse, and confirme thee with the oile of saluation; are the forme of confirmation. But the ancient Martyrs neuer knew them, or practised them. The Apostles no where taught, that these were the words of the institution of that supposed Sacrament.

31 The Popish Synagogue dissolueth mariages contracted, when either party listeth to enter into a monastery before mariage consummated, and at any time afterward, if both the parties consent. But the Apostles and ancient Doctours of the Church beleeued, that no man could separate them, whom God had ioined together.

32 The same beleeueth, that Masse-priests are after the order of Melchisedech, and that they offer Christs body for quicke and dead in the eucharist. But the Apostles and ancient Fathers of the Church taught, that Christ only was a Priest after that order, and that the sacrament was to be receiued of the liuing only, and not offered for quicke and dead.

33 The Masse-priests offer Christs body and bloud, as they say, in the honour of Angels and Saints, and for faire weather, peace, plenty, and good successe in all things. But the apostles taught, that the eucharist was celebrated in remembrance of Christs death and passion, and not in honour of saints and angels: for obteining of remission of sinnes in Christs blood, and not for good successe in temporall matters, or for faire weather. and this was also the faith of primitiue Christians.

34 The Apostles canons, as they are called, doe testifie, that all Christians resorting to the church should receiue the communion

munion before they departed. And this seemeth to be most consonant to Christ his institution, that to those, that were present at his laste supper, said, take and eate, and not, gape and gase. But the synagogue of Rome taketh them for good Christians, that are present at the Masse without receiuing the communion.

According to Christs institution the Apostles and primitiue Martyrs receiued the sacrament of the Lords supper in both kinds. For as well he said, drinke ye all of this, as take and eate But the Popish sect doth neither minister the cuppe to the communicants, nor suffer any to receiue it without hard conditions. 35

The Apostles, and primitiue Martyrs did build no churches nor altars in honour of Angels or saints, nor did they in publike litanies pray to Saint Michaell, or to other Angels to protect them. Nay the councell of Laodicea expressly forbad Christians idolatrously to assemble themselues to praie to Angels. *non oportet* saie the fathers of that councell, *Christianos derelicta ecclesia abire, & ad angelos abominanda idololatriæ congregationes facere.* But the idolatrous followers of the Pope both build Churches in honour of Angels, and make assemblies there, & also pray to them, and serue them. 36

Farre was it from the Apostles, and primitiue Martyrs to say before stockes and stones, Pater noster: and to a wooden crucifer, thou hast redeemed me: or to pray to a crosse for protection, or to dumbe Images for remission of sinnes. For well they knew, that this was impious and fruitlesse. But the Popish sect doe both say and pray in this manner: and neither obserue herein the ancient churches practise, nor Gods commandement. 37

The Martyrs of the primitiue Church did neuer say our Ladies psaulter on their beades, or call her the happy gate of heauen, or praying to her say, O mother of mercy protect vs from our enemies, and receiue vs at the houre of death. But these psaulters and praiers are very frequent with the Papists, and the Pope hath granted great indulgences to those, that say them ouer according as he hath prescribed. 38

The

39 The Apostles adored not Peter, neither did the primitive Martyrs beleeue the Bishop of Rome to be a God on the earth, or the monarch of the church. But now the cardinals adore the Pope, and the Popish faction maketh him their God, and beleeue, that he is the monarch of the Church.

40 The Apostles taught obedience to heathen Princes and infidels; and the primitive martyrs and Christians albeit their number and power were great, thought it neuer lawfull to rebell against them. But now the Popish faction teacheth Christians to rebell against lawfull Princes that will not submit themselues to the Pope, and he excommunicateth such, as will not take armes against them, and his powder-men endeuour to blow them vp.

41 The Canons of the Apostles, as they are called, c. 83. doe punish such, as shall vtter any contumelious speech against Princes and Magistrates. But the Pope curseth all, that will not receiue his yoke, and Parsons and such like parasits are continually publishing infamous libels against them.

42 The Apostles and Primitive Martyrs neuer beleeued, that the Pope had power to depose kings, and to translate kingdomes from one to another. But now this is the common doctrine of Papists, and the Popes doe practise the same as farre as they dare.

43 They neuer beleeued, that the Bishop of Rome had right of both swords, or that he had power to dissolue oths, or to dispense with periured persons. But now the Pope claimeth this authority in right of the Bishop of Rome, and his parasites with all their wit and learning defend it.

44 They neuer beleeued, that it was sinne to breake any order, decretale, or law of the Bishop of Rome. For not only the Bishops of the Easterne Church, but also of Afrike oftentimes resisted him. But now the Popes agents do make their credulous followers beleeue, that the Popes lawes, whom they call Bishop of Rome, do bind in conscience.

45 Finally neither the Apostles nor ancient fathers, or Martyrs taught, or beleeued, that the Bishop of Rome was able to giue indulgences out of the superabundance of Christs and Saints

Saints merites, or to deliuer soules out of Purgatory, or that he had power to procure the displeasure of Saint Peter and Paul, and other saints to such, as he should excommunicate. But now Popish doctors teach all this, and credulous Papists beleeue it, and the Popes themselues shame not to speake it.

I might shew infinit differences betwixt the moderne Papists, and the Apostles and Martyrs of Christ, and the ancient doctors of the Church. But by this, which already I haue said, it may appeare sufficiently, that they are absurdly put in the Roman calendars, as fauourers of the Popish sect. It may appeare also further by the nouelties of the Popes decretales, and schole disputes, which contain infinit quirks and deuises vnknowen to the primitiue Church. But I hast to declare the impieties of the worship and inuocation of Saints, as it is practised in the church of Rome, being a matter principally stood vpon by this Popish proctor and father of the Powder-men of England, Parsons.

CHAP. XI.

That the worship of Saints and Angels practised in the Romish *Church is impious and vnlawfull.*

WIth Parsons it were but lost labour to dispute curiously. For as the common prouerbe teacheth, he that washeth an asses head loseth his labour and his sope. If any list to see this controuersie more largely and fully handled, let him reade the discourse lately published by me against Bellarmines disputations de cultu sanctorum, and other treatises of others, of that argument. Whereto Parsons, if he had not beene Myforum Vltimus, and had respected the honour of his order, he would haue answered somewhat.

But because I would not haue simple people abused with this idle fellowes faire gloses, and vagrant discourses, I haue

haue thought it not amisse for their satisfaction, not only in generall to refute the Popish worship of saints and Angels, but also particularly to argue against their prayers made to them. As for Parsons his allegations, they shall afterward be examined, as they lie in his booke.

To trusse vp therefore this controuersie briefely, it shall be proued, First that the worship of saints and Angels, as the Papists practise it, is contrary to scriptures. Next, that it cannot stand with the doctrine of the Fathers. Thirdly, that it is repugnant to the practise of the auncient Catholike Church, and to reason. And Lastly, that it is not much liked by the soundest, or to speake properly, of the least corrupt Papists.

Popish Worship of saints repugnant to scriptures.

Our Sauior Christ Matth. 4. sheweth, that adoration and seruice for religion sake, is due to God only. *Dominum deum tuum adorabis*, saith he, *& illi soli seruies*, that is, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serue. Where we are to note, that the seruice and worship of creatures, is set forward by the diuell, and that Christ reproueth the same, when it is giuen to them for religion.

1 Likewise saith the Law of Moyses Deuter. 6. thou shalt feare the Lord thy God, and serue him only. The Apostle also Galath. 4. condemneth those which for religious respects serued them, which by nature were not Gods. ἐδουλεύσατε, saith he, τοῖς μὴ οὖσι θεοῖς. That is, ye serued them, which by nature are not Gods. By which words we doe learne, that the honour giuen to saints, called *Dulia*, is expressely condemned.

2 Further the apostle in his epistle to the Colossians exhorteth Christians to be ware, that they be not seduced by humility, and religion of Angels voluntarily deuised. *Nemo vos seducat volens*, saith he, *in humilitate & religione Angelorum.* Vpon which words Chrysostome homil. 7. & 9. in epist. ad coloss. sheweth that such are meant, as thought to be reconciled to God by Angels, and thereupon yelded them worship; which is iust the case of Papists. Theodoret also in his Commentaries vpon this place noteth them as heretikes, that

that built chappels to Saint Michael and declareth them to haue offended against the law, that prayed to Angels. *Offendit lege prohibens*, saith he, *qui precarentur Angelos.*

Matth. 15. Our Sauiour Christ condemneth all formes of religious worship deuised by men. In vaine, saith he, do they worship me, teaching doctrines and precepts of men. And Numb. 3. we reade, that Nadab and Abihu died, when they offered strange fire in the sight of the Lord. But all the worship attributed by Papists to Angels and Saints is deuised by man, as for example, calendring and canonization of Saints by the Pope, the building of Churches and altars, and saying of Masses and offices in their honour, the offering of lights and incense to them, and erecting of Images to Saints and Angels, the kissing of their bones and adoration of them, the swearing by their names, and making vowes vnto them, and such like kinds of seruice done to them. 4

Almighty God in the 6. of Deuter. and diuers other places of Scriptures requireth at our hands the loue and affection of our whole heart. *Diliges dominũ Deum tuum ex toto corde*, saith Moyses, *& in tota anima tua, & in tota mente tua.* But how can they say, that they loue God with their whole heart, that diuide their loue betwixt God and our Lady, Saints and angels? S. Ambrose in his Commentaries vpon the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romanes, accompteth it little better than treason, to giue the honour of the Prince to his followers. And can they be accounted true worshippers, that diuide their seruice and loue betwixt God and creatures? 5

Finally, God saith expressely, Thou shalt haue none other Gods but me. That is, Thou shalt not giue any part of my honour to creatures. But Papists giue a great part of Gods honour to Saints and angels. For they giue them the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiuing, and make vowes vnto them, which are honors due to God, as the Prophet testifieth Psal. 50. *Immola Deo sacrificium laudis*, saith he, *& redde altissimo vota tua.* That is, Sacrifice to God the sacrifice of praise, and pay thy vowes to the most high. Likewise they offer incense vnto them, and present them with diuers gifts and 6

oblations; which the words of the Prophet Hieremy declare to be honours due vnto God. *Venient*, saith he, *de ciuitatibus Iuda &c. portantes holocaustum, & victimam & sacrificium & thus, & inferent oblationem in domum Domini.* They say Masses in the honour of Saints, which themselues confesse to be an honour due to God. Now what nice difference is this, I pray you, to say, they offer not the sacrifice of the Masse to Saints, but in honour of Saints? Could not the Gentiles also say, that they offer not their incense and sacrifices to men, but in the honour of men? Further they sweare by Saints, set vp lights to them, and build temples in their honour. But swearing by Gods name only is an honor proper to God, as we may reade Deut. 6. and S. Augustine sheweth, that temples are not erected to men, but to God.

The worship of Saints and Angels repugnant to the doctrine of the Fathers.

The Fathers also expressly condemne the popish worship of Saints and Angels. Tertullian de præscript. aduers. hæret. numbreth the worshippers of angels among idolaters and heretickes. *Symoniana magia disciplina*, saith he, *Angelis seruien, vtiq; & ipsa inter idololatrias deputabitur.* That is, the doctrine of the Symonians teaching men to serue Angels shall be reckoned also among Idolatries. The worship of them is also condemned by S. Augustine in the heretikes called Angelickes, and by the counsell of Laodicea c. 35.

Origen in his 5. booke cont. Celsum, saith, that no man doth adore heauenly Angels, which submitteth himselfe to the law of Moyses. *Nemo cœlestes Angelos adorat, qui se legi Moysis subdit.*

Cyprian in serm. de lapsis, sheweth, that God is only to be adored and serued, and that such incurre his indignation, that adore creatures and bow to them. *Dicit diuina scriptura*, saith he, *dominum Deum tuum adorabis, & illi soli seruies.* And againe, *Nonne iram diuinæ indignationis ostendens, & pœnam metum præmonens denuo dicit, adorauerunt eos, quos fecerunt digiti eorum, & humiliatus est vir, & non laxabo illi?*

The Christians of Smyrna, when the Gentiles imagined that they would worship Polycarpus, said, they could not leaue Christ, to worship any other. Their words, as Euse-

bius

biust eccles. hist. lib. 4. c. 14. reporteth them, are, *Fieri non potest &c. vt Christum deseramus, vel alium quempiam aliquando colamus.*

Athanasius orat. 3. contr. Arianos sheweth, that neither man, nor angell, nor other creature is to be adored, and concludeth thus, *Quocirca solus est numinis adorari.* Therefore it is proper to God, to be worshipped.

S. Ambrose in Rom. 1. sheweth, that albeit idolaters deny not God, yet they are not to be excused, for that they serue creatures. *Non negant Deum*, saith he, *sed seruiant creaturæ: quo non excusantur, sed accusantur magis, quia cognoscentes non honorant Deum.* He signifieth, that God is not duely honored, when any is serued beside him, especially for religion sake.

Basil. in Psal. 7. sheweth, that nothing is to be worshipped beside God.

Epiphanius hæres. 79. saith, that the Virgin Mary was honourable, but not giuen to vs to be adored. *Reuera Virgo erat Maria, & honorata, sed non ad adorationem nobis data.* He saith also, that neither Iohn nor Helias, is to be adored.

Hierome writing against Vigilantius: who at any time, saith he, ô madde-headed fellow, did worship Martyrs? *Quis ô insanum caput Martyres aliquando adorauit?* Againe, in his Epistles to Riparius, he saith, that Christians adore and worship, neither Martyrs, nor Angels, nor any other creatures.

Cyrillus of Alexandria lib. 6. contra Iulianum, saith, that Christians neither adore Martyrs, neither giue them the title of Gods. *Sanctos Martyres neq; Deos esse dicimus, neq; adorare consueuimus.*

Finally, S. Augustine lib. 8. de ciuit. Dei c. 27. saith, that Christians erect no temples, nor offer sacrifices, or doe other sacred offices to Martyrs. *Nec tamen nos eisdem Martyribus templa, sacerdotia, sacra, & sacrificia constituimus.* In his 44. Epistle ad Maximum, he sheweth, that Christians worship no dead men. And in his booke de vera religione, c. 55. *Non sit nobis religio cultus hominum mortuorum.* Our religion, saith

he, let it not consist in the worship of dead men. and againe They are not, saith he, to be adored for religion sake. *Non sunt adorandi propter religionem.*

The practise of Christs Church is repugnant to the worship of Saints and Angels practised by Papists

The practise of the ancient Catholike Church is also most contrary to the practise of papists in worshipping saints and angels. For first the Pope now taketh vpon him to canonize whom he pleaseth, and to put them into the calendar of saints. But in auncient times the Bishops of Rome challenged to themselues no such prerogatiue, neither did others giue it vnto them. May many are now found registred, as Martyrs, that were either not known, or no friends to the Bishop of Rome. Bellarmine cannot produce any example of a Pope taking on him to canonize saints before Leo the 3.

Now the synagogue of Rome buildeth churches and erecteth altars in the honor of saints and Angels. But Saint Augustine, as before we haue shewed, expressely denieth, that Christians did build Churches, or offer sacrifices in honor of Martyrs.

In auncient time Christians did only honour Martyrs, though not with that worship, that Papists giue to them. Now contrary to that practise, they put in equall rank with Martyrs certeine superstitious Friers, and idle bellied Monkes, and others canonized by the Pope.

Now the Popish lect sweareth by saints and angels, and confesseth their sinnes vnto them, saying, *confiteor deo omnipotenti, B. Mariæ semper virgini, B. Michaeli archangelo, B. Ioanni Baptistæ, Beatis Petro & Paulo, & omnibus sanctis.* But of these seruices done to saints the Papists can bring no authenticall precedent.

Now they erect images in churches to angels and saints, and burne incense vnto them. But this is idolatrous. That cannot be confirmed by any ancient practise. For we haue shewed, that Christians were long without Images in Churches.

Now the Popish synagogue saith Masses in the honor of saints. But neuer shall Parsons proue, that either Christ or-

deined,

deined, or that the fathers practised the celebration of the Lords supper in honour of saints, or Angels.

Finally in their rituall bookes to their *Pater noster*, they adde, *Aue Maria*, and to euery verse of the Psalme *Venite exultemus*, they adde either *Aue Maria*, or *dominus tecum*. In their Litanies they cry out, *sancta Maria ora pro nobis. Sancta dei genitrix, sancta virgo virginum ora pro nobis. Sancte Michael, Sancte Gabriel, Sancte Raphael, omnes sancti angeli & archangeli orate pro nobis, omnes sancti beatorũ spirituũ ordines orate pro nobis.* As they build Churches to God, so they build chappels to our Lady, turning what is said in scriptures to the praise of God, to the praises of our Lady, saying *in te domina confido, ad te clamabo domina mea.* And for our Lady, and seuerall angels and saints, they haue seuerall Psalles, and offices. But he is a very nouice in the Churches practise, that suppoleth any such things to haue beene practised in the ancient Church.

Furthermore * the formes of doctrines of worship of saints and Angels practised by the Popes followers are contrary to the reason and nature of Gods true worship, and to reason it selfe. True religion, saith Saint Augustine lib. de ver. relig. cap. 55. doth bind vs to one God that is of infinite power. *Religat nos religio vni omnipotenti deo.* But the Popish forme of worshipping angels and saints doth cary vs from God, and bind vs to angels and saints.

* *Popish worship of Saints and Angels contrary to the nature of Gods worship, and reason.*

Secondly Christ telleth vs, Iohn 14. that he is the way, the truth, and the life, and Saint Augustine tract. 22. in Ioan. assureth vs, that there is no other meanes to come to God, but by Christ. *Hoc dicit saluator tuus*, saith he, *non est quò eas, nisi ad me; non est quà eas, nisi per me.* Those therefore turne Christians out of the way, that direct them to God by Angels and Saints, and peruert the right course of Christian religion.

Thirdly, it is most absurd, for God to worship and serue creatures, or to ioine them together with almighty God the Creator. For that was the error of the Gentiles. And in this ioyning together things so disproportioned, they cannot by any meanes excuse their absurd course. If then they giue

religious seruice to saints and angels, they cannot defend their religious worship of creatures.

Fourthly, Christ telleth vs, Iohn 16. that whatsoeuer we shall aske in his name, we shall obteine. And of this promise we may rest assured. But there is no promise or assurance, made vnto vs, that we shall obteine any thing by the intercession of angels, or saints departed this life. are they not then very vnreasonable men, that abandon things certaine for hope of things vncertaine?

Fiftly, no man speaketh or praieth to him, that cannot heare, vnlesse he be clearely deuoid of reason. But neuer yet could the Papists shew, that saints departed do heare our praiers. In this point their tongues are diuided: some say one thing, some another. But the most common answeare is this, that the saints see all things in the face of God, as it were in a glasse. But this is the most absurd opinion of all. For neither doe men heare sounds nor perceiue mens thoughts in a glasse. Furthermore, how can they see all things in the essence of God, vnlesse they can comprehend his diuine essence, which passeth mans capacity? lastly this opinion standeth vpon many ambages. For First Papists pray to saints; then God reuealeth to them mans praiers; and Lastly they praie to God for them, as miserable deceiued creatures suppose. Were it not farre more direct to goe to God by Christ; that both can and will heare our praiers?

* The worship of saints not allowed by the aduersaries doctrine.

Finally, the Popish worship of angels and saints is either not agreed vpon by the Papists themselues, or not consonant to the rest of their doctrine. For how the saints doe know that men on earth doe worship them, it is not agreed vpon. Further, Martin Peroz Part 3. tradit. doth not allow, that the worship of Doulia should be giuen to Saints. Thirdly Bellarmine lib. 1. de sanct. beat. cap. 7. confesseth, that seuen sorts of honours are due to Saints canonized, to wit, calendring in the Catalogue of Saints, Inuocation, Churches and altars, Halles and offices, holidaies, lights, Images, and pretious shrines. He might also haue added vowes and othes by their reliques. But these honours are neither proued

ued by warrant of scriptures, nor testimony of fathers. Fourthly, they all confesse, that saints neither are in all places, nor know mens thoughts. Why then are they worshipped and called vpon in all places? and how can they discerne, whether mens worship be feined, or not? Finally they teach, that no sacrifice is to be offered to saints. But praiers, praises, and incense be sacrifices. Further they say Masses in the honour of saints and Angels. But what is it to offer in the honour of saints, but to offer to them? If the Pope should giue a Cardinall hat to Parsons, doth he not offer it to him?

CHAP. XII.

That the Popish inuocation of Angels, and Saints is contrary to Christian religion, and sauoureth not only of impiety, but also of foolery.

BUt although the whole forme of Popish worship of Angels and saints be impious and absurd; yet no part of it more, then their praiers and offices made in their honour. For these * are directly contrary to the doctrine of Christ concerning praier, and to other textes of holy scriptures. Our Sauiour Christ Matth. 6. teaching his disciples to pray, commanded them to say, Our father which art in Heauen; and to direct their praiers to him, and not to the mother of mercy, as Papists call our lady, or to Angels or Saints.

* *Popish inuocation of saints contrary to holy scriptures.*

Secondly, if we pray to God in Christs name, we haue an assured promise, that we shall obtaine. If yee aske the father any thing in my name, saith our Sauior to his disciples, Iohn 16. he will giue it you. But the like promise, or assurance is not made to those, that call vpon saints or angels.

Lastly, holy scriptures teach vs, that God only is our succour, refuge, helpe, defender, protector, and to whom in publike and priuate praiers, and in all our necessity we are to haue recourse, as we reade Psal. 18.46. and 124. likewise in the 13. of Hosea God saith, *tantummodo in me auxilium tuum.*

Saint Iames also telleth vs, that euery good and perfect gift is from aboue, and commeth downe from the father of lights. Scriptures also to withdraw vs from the honouring of creatures, teach vs, not to trust in them, as we may read Psal. 117. and Hierom. 17. Finally they shew, that grace is through Christ, and that man can challenge nothing through his owne merit, as we may reade Rom 6. and 7. the praiers therefore of Papists to Angels and saints, that teach men to distrust Christs mercy, and to trust in the helpe and merites of creatures, are impious, and plainely repugnant to scriptures.

[a] *Popish inuocation of Angels and saints contrary to the doctrine of the fathers.*

Inuocation [a] also of angels and saints, as it is practised in the Romish Church, is contrary to the doctrine of diuers fathers, and vnknowen to the rest. Irenæus lib. 2. aduers. hæres. c. 58. speaking of diuers graces wrought by the Church, sheweth, that by inuocation of Angels she did nothing, but only by the inuocation of the name of Christ. *Nec inuocationibus angelicis, saith he, fecit aliquid.*

Origen lib. 5. contr. Celsum saith, that it is against reason to inuocate Angels. *Angelos inuocare absque ipsorum cognitione, cuius homo capax non est, non videtur rationi consentaneum.* And in the 8. booke against Celsus: *cui primitias offerimus, saith he, ad eundem etiam vota precesque nostras dirigimus, habentes pontificem magnum Iesum ipsius Dei filium.* That is, to whom we offer our first fruites, to him also we direct our praiers and vowes, hauing for our chiefe priest, Iesus the sonne of God himselfe. and againe, *obiitus sa cum Christianis agere, soli deo per Iesum Christum preces offerentibus.* Hauing forgot, saith he, that he had to deale with Christians, which doe offer their praiers to God alone through Iesus Christ.

Lactantius lib. 2. diuin instit. c. 18. condemneth them of impiety and wickednes, that become suppliants to dead men. *qui mortuis supplicant.*

What can be more iniurious, reproachfull, & hard, saith Arnobius lib. 6. contr. gentes, then to know God, and to pray to another thing?

Saint Ambrose in epist. ad Rom. c. 1. condemneth such as vse mediators to God, as men doe to kings, and sheweth, that

that God knoweth al things, & needeth not any to tel him of our matters. The like saying hath Chrysostom, I haue set downe both their words at large in my Latine treatise of this controuersie.

Saint Augustine in the 22. book de ciuitate Dei c. 10. speaking of Martyrs, saith they are named in their place and order; and yet not so, that they are called vpon by the Priest, that offereth sacrifice. *Suo loco & ordine nominantur*, saith he, *non tamen a sacerdote, qui sacrificat, inuocantur.* Likewise lib. 10. de ciuit. Dei c. 19. he sheweth, that the sacrifice of praier and praises is not to be exhibited to Angels, or to other then God.

Synodus quæ conuenit Laodiceæ, quæ est Phrygiæ metropolis, saith Theodoret. in epist. ad Colos. c 2. *lege prohibuit, ne precarentur angelos.* that is, the synode that assembled at Laodicea the mother City of Phrygia, by a law forbad men to pray to Angels.

[a] Thirdly, Popish inuocation of angels and saints is contrary to the practise of the ancient Catholike Church. For neuer did ancient Catholikes after the Lords praier say *Aue maria gratia plena, dominus tecum, benedicta tu in mulieribus, & benedictus fructus ventris tui Iesus. Sancta maria mater dei ora pro nobis peccatoribus & nunc & in hora mortis nostræ.* that is, Haile mary ful of grace, the Lord is with thee, blessed art thou amongst women, and blessed is the friut of thy wombe. holy Mary mother of God pray for vs sinners now, and at the houre of our death. Neither did they pray, *Aue Maris stella &c.* that is Haile starre of the sea &c. and afterward, loose the bands of those, that are called foorth in iudgement, bring foorth a light to the blind, put away our euils, aske for vs all good things, shew your selfe to be a mother.

[a] *Inuocation of Angels and saints contrary to the churches practise.*

Nor do we reade, that euer they prayed to the crosse saying, *ô crux aue spes vnica, hoc passionis tempore &c.* that is, ô crosse our only hope, haile, at this time of the passion, increase righteousnesse in the godly, and grant pardon to sinners. At Cahors they pray thus: *Sudarium Christi liberet nos a peste, & morte tristi.* Thou napkin of Christ deliuer vs from the

the plague, and heauy death: but ancient Catholickes were neuer taught to say so. Nor did they sing as the Papists doe vpon the feast of all Saints, saying; *beata quoq; agmina cœlestium &c.* that is, you blessed troupes of heauenly spirits put from vs all euils both past, present, and to come. Finally the prayers of Popish missals, breuiaries, and Ladies Psalters now common among Papists are matters vnknowen to the ancient Church.

a Inuocation of Angels and Saints contrary to Christs office.

[a] These impious formes of prayer practised by Papists are derogatory, and sometimes contrary to the nature of Christs priesthood, and mediatorship. For the same suppose, that the Angels and Saints are more inclinable to mercy, than Christ Iesus. The same also make them Priests to reconcile vs to God, and to pray for vs, and giue vnto them the office of Christs mediation, contrary to the words of Scriptures and Fathers, as is shewed at full in my treatise against Bellarmine concerning this controuersie.

b The same is contrary to reason.

[b] The same also are contrary to reason. For what can be deuised more vnreasonable, than to call vpon them in all places, who are not in all places? againe, what more absurd than to crie to them, that heare not? nay to pray to them, that neither know vs, nor can helpe vs? Finally what greater folly, than not to call vpon God, through Christ, as we are commanded, being assured that we shall obtaine what we aske: and to runne to Saints and Angels without either commandement or promise?

c The same not well liked by the aduersaries themselues.

[c] Finally, the aduersaries themselues in that forme of protestation, which they make, when they lie a dying confesse plainly, that they hope not to be saued, but in the merits of Christs passion. Where are then the merits and prayers of Saints? Erasmus in Naufragio laugheth at them, which in their distresse fly to Saints for succour, and approueth his opinion, that in that case went directlie to Christ.

Cassander in his consultation confesseth, that for his owne part he vsed to direct his praiers to God by Christ, and not by Saints.

Canisius in the exposition of the decalogue refuteth those, that

that giue diuine power to men. But vnleſſe Saints haue diuine power, they can neither heare mens prayers in all places, nor are able to helpe them, nor ought to haue the incenſe of prayers offered vnto them.

Coſterus in his Manual of controuerſies c. de venerat. ſanctor. ſaith, that Saints do only pray, becauſe they can pretend no right. But if this be ſo, then are all thoſe prayers blaſphemous, which are grounded vpon Saints merits: which ſuppoſe a right.

Generally, Papiſts are very vncertaine, how Saints do come to the knowledge of things done heere below. Bellarmine lib. de ſanct. beat. c. 20. bringeth foure diuers opinions concerning this matter, and himſelfe imagineth, that they ſee all things in the face of God, as it were in a glaſſe. But this brittle and glaſſie opinion we haue already refuted.

Finally, albeit our aduerſaries alledge diuers texts of Scripture out of the old and new Teſtament for proofe of prayers to Angels and Saints; yet they confeſſe, that before Chriſt the Patriarkes were not happy, nor enioied the ſight of God. And Eckius in Enchirid. c. de venerat. ſanct. confeſſeth that the inuocation of Saints is not expreſſly ſet down in Scriptures. Doe they not then confeſſe, that they abuſe their readers and ſcholars, when they alledge texts of ſcripture, which by their owne confeſſion are not to purpoſe? Parſons therefore ſheweth himſelfe a rude and ignorant fellow, to talke of calendars, canonizing, worſhipping and inuocation of Saints, being contrary to Scriptures, Fathers, and all antiquity, vnleſſe the foundation of his diſcourſe had beene more certaine, and his arguments better concludent.

What he hath brought and performed ſhall appeare God willing, in the diſcourſe following.

The

The third Booke, containing a Collection, and Examination of *Parsons his vagrant discourses not* formerly refuted.

CHAP. I.

Observations vpon the title, and front of Parsons *his booke, and vpon his epistle dedicatory.*

IF the great iudgement and learning of Robert Parsons we may make some reasonable coniecture by the title, and front of his booke. He calleth it The third part of a treatise intituled; of three conuersions of England. But first for a third part, he giueth vs but a moiety of a third part, like a false iugling marchant keeping backe halfe of that which he promised. His title is no more correspondent to his book, then if he should set vp an alestake at his putatiue fathers forge, where is nothing to sell but nailes and horseshoes and iron stuffe, and not one drop of drinke. In the body of his discourse he talketh only of Calendars, and worshipping of saints. But what maketh all that toward the conuersion of England? may not other nations worship saints, and keepe Calendars, and yet not be conuerted by the Pope, or his agents? May all this which he babbleth of this argument, pertaineth rather to an auersion from Christian religion, then a conuersion to it.

To shew his skill in Greeke he telleth vs, what a Parallel or comparison of Calendars he hath made. But euery child, that

that hath learned any Greek can tell, that he should haue said Parallel, & not Parael, as he hath it; & that Parallel doth not signifie a comparison, but a thing set by & compared to another.

Thirdly, he promiseth a defece of a certain trial &c. as he calleth it. But he should haue said a defence of his owne relation of that triall. And yet had he so said, he should haue shewed himself a distoposed fellow, that conioineth matters of so different nature in one volume, and an idle relator, who being himself charged with grosse lying, impertinent alledging and falsifying of authors, answereth nothing for himselfe, but is still piding about the pelting discourse of Cardinall Peron. In the first he sheweth himself like to him, that milked goates and poked sores; in the second to that mad man, that neglecting his own all torne cloathes, was stil stitching and brushing his fellowes garments.

But of Saint Augustine lib. 3. contr. Parmen. c. 6. he telleth vs, how sacrilegious schismatikes, and impious heretikes dare presume, when they are punished, to account the punishment of their fury, for true Martyrdome. But First he translateth lewdly, turning schismes and heresies into schismatikes and heretikes. Next he falsifyeth that fathers testimony, leauing out that which he saith, of the correction of heretiks and schismatikes in flagello, and adding the word true, to Martyrdome. Lastly he bringeth that, which may serue to confound himselfe, and his owne consorts. For Popish inquisitors doe not punish heretikes for their amendement, which as Saint Augustine sheweth, was done in the case of the Donatistes, but seeke to cut mens throtes, and to destroy all that speake against them. Secondly, albeit for the Popes quarrell furiously the English Masse-priests oppugning true religion, their Prince, and country; yet when they are punished for treason they will needes haue it Martyrdome. Saint Augustines words are these. *Audent sacrilega schismata, vel hæreses impiæ, si quando in flagello, vt se corrigant, admonentur, panas furoris sui etiam inter Martyria deputare.* Which iustifie euery point of our charge. He addeth also to the words of the text Matth. 25 where he saith, that God shall separate them asunder (at

the day of Iudgement) as the shepheard doth separat the sheep from the goates. For these words, at the day of Iudgement are not there found. He translateth also these words leudly, *oues ab hœdis*. For he should say, sheepe from kids. Lastly he condemneth his owne mates, who line wantonly and luxuriously like goates, and therefore if they repent not, are to looke to haue their portion with goates, or kids.

Neither doth he better acquit himselfe in his epistle dedicatory. It is directed to the Protestants of England: a fauour which they accept not. For what fauour can they expect at his hands, that raileth vpon them to their face, when he would seeme to gratifie them? the title also they like not, being not to be termed Protestants, but true Christians, and Catholikes, albeit the notorious wrongs and impieties of Papists giue them iust occasion, both to protest against them, and to detest them.

To giue vs a taste of his true dealing throughout his whole treatise, he beginneth his epistle with diuers most shamelesse and absurd lies. For first he giueth out, that the religion, which Papists now professe is the same which Christ and his Apostles first taught, and which for many yeares was continued, and professed by the ancient fathers of the Church. A matter so absurd and ridiculous, as the author himselfe. For to talke of no other points, who doth not wonder at his antique impudency, that bluscheth not to affirm, that the doctrin of Papists cõteined in the decretales, missals, breuiaries, & schole-mes writings, concerning Holy water, Paschall lambes, agnus deies, worship of Angels, Saints, Images, the carnall eating of Christs body, transubstantiation, the communion vnder one kind, the being of Christs body on euery altar and in infinite places at one time, the Popes headship, his indulgences, Purgatory, limbus patrum, seuen sacraments, S. Francis his wounds, and such like matters was taught by Christ and his Apostles, and continued vntill our times by continuall tradition of the fathers?

Secondly he affirmeth that our church was neuer visible in the world for 1200. yeares, and that M. Fox could not find any

any society or Church, to whom he durst betake himselfe out of the Roman Church. He meaneth the moderne Romish Church. For concerning that, is all our variance. But there in he lieth as grossely as before. For the Apostolik Church, and the church, wherein the ancient fathers lined was same and knowen of the faithfull, and of that Church we profesle our selues to be, admitting all that doctrine, which they taught, and refusing the nouelties of Papists and other heretikes, which bringing in diuers profane, and impious, and false doctrines, haue erected to themselues particular Chappels and Churches diuers from Christs Catholike Church. These two false suppolals being the principall grounds of his whole discourse, we may easily iudge how ruinous it is like to proue being wholy founded vpon lies.

Thirdly he surmiseth, that M. Fox went about to frame to himselfe a new Church, and that consisting partly of impious heretikes, and partly of wicked malefactors, and there he nameth Sir Iohn Old-castle, Sir Roger Acton, Zizea, Iohn Claydon, Elenor Cobham, Roger Only, King, Debnam, Marsh, Colins, Cowbridge, Peter German, Iohn Vesalian, Iohn Frith, and Anthony Parson. But as he belieth both vs, and the Papists in generall; so particularly he wrongeth Master Foxe, and diuers other honest men, and godly Martyrs. For first it was neuer Master Foxs intention to frame to himselfe a new Church, but rather to shew, that we profesle the old Catholike faith: from which Papists are so far digressed. Secondly we find no such man, as Peter German registred as a Martyr, or holding so damnable opinions, as is pretended. Thirdly neither Colins, nor Cowbridge is set downe, as a Martyr by Master Fox, but both set downe as madmen cruelly handled by brutish Papists for offering some disgrace to Popish religion. and this Master Fox himselfe answereth. The author of the Calendar, I confesle, was therein mistaken. But that was not Master Foxes fault. Lastly all the rest are sufficiently cleared from this wicked fellowes calúniations. Could Parsons so wel cleare Popish rebels, traitors, and powder-men that sought to

ouer-

ouerturne the state, it were good for him.

Fourthly he citeth two places out of S. Augustine: The one lib. 20. de ciuit. dei c. 9. the other serm. 181. de tempore, most falsely, and maketh that holy father to say, that the soules of some saints departed out of this life in the faith, and in Gods grace are in paines and purgation, and praied for by vs. Which that holy Doctor neuer thought vpon. For in the first place he saith only that the soules of the godly after death are not separated from the Church. and proueth it, for that their names are mentioned at the altar. *Neque enim piorum animæ mortuorum*, saith he, *separantur ab ecclesia, quæ etiam nunc est regnum Christi, alioqui nec ad altare dei fieret eorum memoria in communione corporis Christi.* In the second place he sheweth, that praiers after death profit nothing. *Cum abducti fuerimus ab hoc seculo &c. licet fudamus preces, & innumeris obsecrationibus proclamemus*, saith he, *nemo audiet, nemo subueniet.* And in al that 181. serm. de tempore, there is nothing of praying for soules in Purgatory.

The rest of his epistle dedicatory is nothing but idle talke, and rather maketh for vs, then against vs. For neither doe we deny, that it is a blessed thing to haue fellowship with God, and the holy members of Christs Church, nor that it is a disgrace to be held companiõs with theeues, murderers, wicked persons, and heretikes; and therefore haue carefully cleared our selues from all Parsons his sclanderous imputations in this behalfe. But this being confessed by our aduersaries, doth argue them to be most wretched, and miserable, and vtterly disgraced. For first they haue forsaken the cõmunion of Christs Church by embracing a particular faith taught them by the Pope and his complices. And next they cannot deny, that they haue fellowship with heretikes, sodomites, vsurers, murtherers, empoisoners, assassinors, powder men, miners of states, adulterers, and impious Atheists. For such haue bene diuers Popes, whom they professe to be their heads. Such haue bene their prelates, Monkes, and Friers, with whom they hold fellowship; and that their owne stories testifie. May of late time such among

our

our aduersaries haue béene reputed Martyrs, as haue either conspired against lawfull magistrates, or murdred kings, or cut the throtes of innocent Christians, or filled mens heads with nouelties and superstitious opinions, or else men knowen to be of a notorious leud and wicked life. Furthermore Parsons confesseth, that the Catholik Church is a communion of saints, and rightly calleth it *sortem sanctorum*, a lot or portion of saints. Which is the doctrine of our Church, which excludeth all notorious leud men living without remorse of conscience, and repentance from being true members of the true Church, and is denied by our aduersaries expressely. *Vt aliquis aliquo modo dici possit pars veræ ecclesiæ*, saith Bellarmine, de eccles. milit. c. 2. *de qua scripturæ loquuntur, non putamus requiri vllam internam virtutem.* Thus you see, no vertue is required by our aduersaries, to make a man a member of the true Church. Parsons also by this doctrine of his excludeth the Pope from being head of the Church, if he be an Heretike, or a leud man, or none of the number of Saints.

Finally he speaketh most absurdly. For first he will admitte none to be of the Catholike Church, but such as are of the Roman Church, which is in effect as much as if he would make the diocese of Rome as bigge as the world, and exclude all the people of God before Christ, and those which since Christ were no subiects to the Pope out of the Catholike Church. This foolish conceit S. Hierome refuteth, where he telleth vs, that the world is bigger then Rome. *Orbis vrbe maior.* Next he saith, the greatest part of mans good or euill consisteth in a certaine communion, participation, society, fellowship and communication with others. As if a man were happy, because hee had communion with godly and vertuous men; or miserable, because he hath fellowship with poore, and miserable men. Or else, as if the wicked had no fellowship in outward profession of faith and sacraments with the godly; which is meere Donatisme. Holy scriptures teach vs farre otherwise. For they shew, that men are not happy for the fellowship they haue with others, but because

Gods mercy, and grace, and assurance of eternall life is giuen them through Christ. They teach vs also, that good and bad, happie men and miserable are ioyned together in the eternall society of the Church, as chaffe and corne in one floore; herbes and weedes in one field; good and bad fish in one net. Ridiculously also he maketh communion, and communication, society and fellowship to signifie diuers things. If not, then he heapeth vp diuers idle words in one sentence and all to no purpose.

CHAP. II.

Parsons *his notes of Heretikes suffering obstinatly for their opinions, and the testimonies of fathers brought by him to proue the same, returned vpon himselfe, and his consortes.*

AFter his epistle dedicatory, Parsons letteth downe his double Calendar. But thereof we haue spoken so fully, that I doubt not, but his double, if not treble folly will appeare, not only to Christians, but to those that are of the society of his treble crowned Pope. For in examination thereof we haue first made knowen the rage and cruelty of the whore of Babylon and her louers against the saints of God; and next we haue shewed, that the Apostles, primitiue Martyrs, and ancient fathers of the Church haue no fellowship, either with triple crowned Popes, or polshorne Massepriests, or superstitious and idle Monkes, or busie and seditious friers, or the new vpstart Iebusits or their complices.

Now therefore it followeth, that we consider of his notes of diuers heretikes and sectaries obstinatly persisting in their opinions, and sometimes offring themselues to death for the same. These he maketh and deuiseth himselfe, laying an imputation vpon those godly Martyrs, which suffered death for defence of truth against the heresies of Popery, as if they had died wilfully without any ground of their opinions. But we haue sufficiently refuted this sclanderous imputation

tation already. Furthermore the whole course of their actes doth shew, that the faith which they defended, is grounded vpon holy scriptures, and confirmed by testimony of fathers, and practise of the Church, and diuers other arguments: and contrariwise, that the heresies and wicked doctrines of Papists which they refused, were by them declared to be repugnant to holy scriptures, and vnknowen to ancient Martyrs, and fathers of the church. Further, they alwaies shewed themselues willing to be instructed, and neuer refused conference. Nay no man shewed himselfe vnwilling to yeeld, if he could be conuinced by scriptures.

But the Papists relie wholly vpon the Popes determination, a man oft times as blind in matters of religion, as a beetle. Further, they refuse all conference and disputation, for the most part. Thirdly they offer their liues, not for religion, but for the maintenance of the Popes tyranny and trash. Finally they refuse to yeeld to holy Scriptures, telling vs of the Catholicke churches faith, of which they are most ignorant. If then Parsons seeke for examples of obstinacy in heretiks, he need to go no further, than to his owne consorts, and his own examples. In the daies of king Henry the eight, king of England, a woman of Kent, by the Papists called the holy maid of Kent, albeit she was conuinced to be neither maid nor holy, stood in her fond opinions against the Kings authority to the death. The like also did certaine Priests her complices. And yet was she an ignorant woman, and the Priests men of no capacity, nor meanes to defend their opinions.

Thomas More and Fisher of Rochester were of more learning; yet so inueigled with popish errors, that they chose rather to lose their heads, than to acknowledge the Kings supreme authority ouer all persons in this realme, and to renounce the Popes vsurped power. Their only motiue was wilfulnesse and obstinacy in old errors. Many also were they abused by the impostures of the woman of Kent, and her complices.

The Monkes and Friars also, that either rebelled against the king, or gaue out words against the kings authority, were

men vnable to defend the Popes cause: yet would they needs die in his quarrell.

Friar Forest gaue great tokens of feare and trouble of conscience when he died, yet would he not reuoke his traiterous opinions, but persisted in them to the death.

To come to matters done in our times. Edmund Campian, and his adherents, that came to make a side for the Pope in England, chose rather to die, than to forsake the party of publike enemies. Being vrged to declare his opinion concerning the Bull of Pius Quintus, against Queene Elizabeth, obstinately he refused to doe the same. Yet if it be a matter of faith, as Papists say, to beleeue the Popes supreme authority, then ought he to haue yelded a reason of his faith in this point.

The like peruersnesse and obstinacy did his fellow Sherwin shew, both in his answers, and at his death. For neither would he renounce the faction of forren enemies, nor condemn the fact of the Northren, and Irish rebels, nor acknowledge the Queenes lawfull power.

Briant, another Priest of this sect, refused to answer being examined, and going to execution chaued his crowne, and openly declared the Pope to be the vniuersall bishop, and head of the Church, and for that doctrine died, which Gregory a bishop of Rome denied.

Luke Kirby being asked, whether the Pope, or any by his commandement inuading the Realme, he would take part with the Queene, or the Pope, refused most peruersly to declare himselfe her subiect, nay albeit he might haue saued his life thereby, yet would he not say, that he would either defend and take part with the Queene, or refuse to take part with publicke enemies.

Laurence Richardson stood stifly in defence of the Popes vsurped authority, in deposing Kings and Princes, and would not either declare his dislike of the rebellions of Papists in England and Ireland against the Queene, or else professe, that he would vndertake her defence against publicke enemies, that should inuade his native country.

Thomas

Thomas Cotton protested obstinately, that touching the Popes Bull concerning the Queene, and the attempts of rebels in England and Ireland for maintenance of popish religion, he would maintaine the doctrine of the Romish church. Now who knoweth not, that the same treachery rebellion and murder of Princes upon warrant of the Popes treasonable constitutions?

John Shert another of that seditious crew confessed plainly that he would take the Popes part, if warres were moved for religion. He declared also, that the Pope had authority to depose Princes, and allowed the seditious libels of Sanders and Bristow, maintaining the cause of rebels against their Prince, and of the Pope against their country.

The like impudency and obstinacy shewed the rest of that traiterous packe, and so they died not for Christ, but for Antichrist, not as Martyrs, but as Machiavelian parkers against the state, yeelding only an externall obedience, as was expressed in the faculties granted to Parsons and Campian, *rebus sic stantibus*, that is, so long as things continued in state as they were then: not as Christian Subjects suffering for religion but as notorious traytors committing treason and treason.

John Paine a Welsh priest being convicted partly by his owne confession and partly by witnesses to have had secret conferences with known traytors, and publicke enemies of his country concerning attempts against the Queenes person and the state, would neither acknowledge his errors, nor repent himself of them. And therefore justly was he executed, as a wilfull traitor, and a stout and sturdy champion of the cause of Antichrist.

Edward Haule confessed freely, that he was the Popes subject, and that the Pope hath as much power in England, as he now exerciseth in Rome. He added further, that the Pope could not erre in matters of faith. And for maintenance of the Popes errors, and tyrannicall usurpation heeres he would die, being a man ignorant in religion, and obstinate in his opinions, and as void of piety, as full of malice and trechery.

Cuthert Maine was taken sealed of an agnus Dei, certaine blessed graines, and a Bull of the Pope, being particularly examined he defended the Popes graines, and all his trash being not worth a graine of mustard seed. If he had but one graine of religion, he might haue knowen, that the doctrine of the church of Rome hoping to haue remission of sins by these agnus Dei's and graines is impious. The sixth synode Can. 82. condemneth the making of these formes. And lawes prohibit all signes of faction such as these graines, and medalles are. But nothing anailed with this obstinat fellow.

Iohn Nelson a factious Masse-priest albeit he had declared the Quæne to be a schismatike, and an heretike according to the Popes decrees, of which by their collections it followed, that *ipso facto* she had lost her crowne; yet would he neuer recall his words, nor acknowledge his offence. Nay he refused to conferre with such as offred to reason with him and to instruct him.

Thomas Sherwood obstinetly maintained, that the Quæne was lawfully and iustly excommunicated and deposed, and stood against his Princes right for the Pope to the death. Such is the power of Antichrist to infatuate his slaues, and vassals, and such is the blyndnesse peruersitie, and obstinacy of his infatuated slaues.

This obstinacy appeareth to haue beene in the rest of the Masse-priests feeding like the Popes doggs of the crummes of his trencher facultie, and fatted in his seminaries like calues ordeined to be sent ouer to be slaughtred for defence of his triple crowne, and quadruple vsurpations and heresies.

Parsons also himselfe telleth of diuers heretikes in the daies of Henry the second, and their Kings of England, whereof one was a melting deacon, and another shewed Christs wounds in his hands, feete, and side like Friar Francis the founder of the Franciscans, and Mary the prioresse the house of the Annunciada in Lisbone; all which died obstinatly. But all these as they sauoured of Popish superstition, so they were infatuated with the peruishnesse of popish sectaries.

He runneth also downe through diuers kings reignes, and picketh out of Stowe and others, diuers examples some of heretikes, some of true Christians, iumbling all together like a confused cobler of stories, and proouing the obstinacy of his consorts and other heretikes. But all his examples are needelesse, for we confesse it to be true, that most simple heretikes are most obstinate in their opinions; and specially the same by the Papists.

Whatsoeuer therefore Saint Cyprian, Chrysostome, Pacianus, Austine, Fulgentius or Gregory hath written against heretikes and schismatikes wilfully standing in their wicked opinions, the same doth iustly fall vpon the pild pates, and shauen crownes of the peruerse and seditious Masse-priests wilfully dying for the Popes quarrell, and for the maintenance of the kingdome of Antichrist. As Cyprian saith, lib. de simplic. prælat. they are aliens and prophane persons, and cannot with any blood or death purge this fault. And to them their sufferings shall not bee a crowne of faith, but a punishment of their perfidiousnesse. Chrysostome homil. 11. in epist. ad Ephes. sheweth, that such as breake the vnity of Christs church, shall be punished no lesse, then those were, that offered violence to his body, being on earth. Saint Augustine lib. 4. de bap. contr. Donatist. c. 17. saith, that neither baptisme nor suffering for the faith profiteth schismatikes, being out of the Church. The same father lib. 1. de sermon. dom. in monte c. 9. saith, in those that suffer where there is no true faith, that iustice is not found. The like sayings may be found in other places of that father, in Pacianus epist. 2. ad Sympron. And Fulgentius de fid. ad Petr. And others. Finally Gregory lib. 2. epist. 36. saith, that not the paine, but the cause maketh a Martyr. But all maketh against Parsons, and his consorts, and powder men Papists, who suffred not for iustice, but for the Popes vsurpations, not for religion, but for treason, and are therefore to be reputed for prophane persons, offering violence to Christs body, and seeking the destruction of their Prince and country.

Let not therefore Parsons brag of his Martyrs the Masse-

priests, and their complices suffering death wilfully or rather obstinately for the Popes cause, and for plaine treason in the highest degree. For so also have the Arians, Donatistes, Anabaptists and Turkish assassins done before them. May these heretiks and infidels haue suffered death with farre more resolution and constancy, then the heretical Papists. Frier Forest, when he was executed, cried and roared, like a hellhound. Campian, when he came to the gallowes and thought there to make a rhetoricall speake, was scarse able to vtter any words at all. Such was his feare and amazement. Iohn Shert laid hands on the rope, and could not be made to let goe his hold till his strength failed him. Cottam railed and cursed the people standing round about him praying that fire might come downe from heauen, and consume them. Doctor Story strugled with the hangman, and stroke him. But the hangman was to strong for him. Finally in the endes of these men there appeared nothing, but feare, amazement, and stupidity. God giue their consorts grace to see their euill cause and conscience, that they may auoid like endes.

CHAP. III.

The foolery and absurdity of Parsons *his directions for the vse of his double Calendar.*

BEfore Robert Parsons doth come to his matter, he giueth his reader diuers directions, and setteth forth certaine animaduersions concerning his proceedings. But honest and discreet Christians seeme to be directed by such a blind, and peruerse guide, and his disciples the Papists are so farre out of the way, that his instructions will not serue to help them. Further these his directions and animaduersions doe shew, that his whole worke is like an old kettle full of holes, and he like to an old tinker, that sitteth downe to clout them. For his worke without this clouterie of directions, and animaduersions will no more hold together, then a broken kettle full of holes can hold water. Yet his frendes doe

feare,

feare, lest it fall out with him, as it doth with tinkers, that mending one hole, make two; or as it doth with blacksmithes that thinking to make fast a shoe, cloy a horse. For hoping to excuse himselfe, and to yeld a reason of his broken dealing in this his tinkerly worke of three conuersions of England, he doth make the matters worse then before.

First he saith he doth not prosecute all the particulars set downe by Master Fox. but therein he declareth himselfe to be a fallary, that taketh what may make for himselfe, and leaueth out, whatsoeuer may serue to cleare the party charged by him. Secondly he telleth vs, that he doth not lay foorth such praises, as Master Fox relateth. But that is not the worst of his matter. For he doth not only conceale such things, as make for the Martyrs praises, but also forgeth false and slanderous tales out of his owne tinkerly inuention, thereby to bring honest men into obloquy and slander. Thirdly he affirmeth, that whatsoeuer he hath written, he hath taken it commonly out of Master Foxe, or some other good author. But that sheweth, that he hath forged many things of his owne head, albeit he addeth not commonly.

Furthermore ridiculously he reputeth Cochleus, Staphylus, Bosser, Copus, Iohn Stow a botcher of stories, and the patched Roman Martyrologe to be good authors: which either are hired to speake vntruth, or else are full of fables, or else speake partially in their owne causes. Lastly, we haue both heretofore declared, and shall hereafter proue more fully, that diuers of his reports are deuised without any author good or bad.

In the beginning of this direction, he seemeth to shiuer for feare, lest the sight of the two precedent calendars haue put men in some doubt or perplexity. But his supposed feare is most vaine and ridiculous. For that Calendar, which he calleth ours, was deuised by the Corrector of M. Foxes booke, when it was printed, and for the more speedy finding out of the time of euery mans triall, is put before the booke, and of vs is not much regarded. The other conteineth the names of men of diuers beliefes, and opinions, and was deuised for the

dishonour

dishonour of God, and worship of creatures, and therefore in that respect of all godly men condemned. If he spake of Papists, where he speaketh of perplexity; yet hath he no reason to imagine them to be perplexed, seeing they neither make question of their owne calendar, nor much care for the calendar prefixed before M. Foxes booke. Nay, they are expressly forbidden to reade our bookes. They haue rather cause to be perplexed, seeing not only the difference betweene the Apostles and primitiue Fathers and Martyrs, on the one side, and the Monkes and Friars and Saints canonized by the Pops on the other side, but also the great variance betwixt the Popish calendars, of Sarum, Paris, Spaine, Rome and other nations, euery one worshipping seuerall Saints, and that with such a forme of worship, as is neither prescribed in Scriptures, nor knowen to ancient Catholickes, but rather contrary to Scriptures and Fathers.

Afterward he proceedeth in his dreaming fiction, and telleth vs, how by contentions and contradictions (viz. about Calendars) the hearer is brought into a certaine distraction of mind, ambiguity, mistrust, and vnbeliefe of all: which S. Paul calleth the subuersion of them that heare. But first, if any man contend about these matters, it is Robert Parsons himselfe, that first moued this ridiculous contention about Calendars, being like a puppy Halle-priest, not yet sufficiently instructed in his breuiary. As for vs, we neither stand vpon the one, nor the other Calendar. Was this man then, trow you, wise that pronounceth sentence against himselfe, as a subuerter of his hearers, and a fellow, that had brought his Disciples, to a distraction of mind, to an ambiguity, mistrust, and vnbeliefe of all? Secondly, he doth shamefully wrest the words of the Apostle contrary to his meaning. For where he speaketh of the subuersion of the hearers, he vnderstandeth not our questions about the worship of saints, which tendeth much to the edification of the hearers, but brables about words, and such idle matters, which maketh much against Parsons his contentious stirre about Calendars. Thirdly, he applieth to this purpose the words of

the

the Apostle Tit. 3. as if he that were brought into doubt concerning diuers Calendars, or such matters, were condemned by his owne iudgement. For so Parsons, that is not skilled in Greek turneth it. But neither doth he rightly translate the Apostles words, nor truly cite them, nor doth the Apostle speake of Calendars, but of hereticall teachers, that will not abide holesome admonitions. the first is proued for that αὐτοκατάκριτος doth signifie, condemned by his owne fact, and not by his iudgement. For that few heretickes in their owne opinion take themselues to be in the wrong. The second is manifest; for that he leaueth out these words, *& delinquit.*

The matter being thus made hainous by this vnbridgeous Friar, afterward he endeuoreth to calme the stormes of his owne swlish conceit, and to bring men, as he pretendeth, to a calme, and quiet state of deuotion. But if a man should long to see a singular peece of swlery; he could not better satisfie his desire, then in contemplating this most nasty, swlish and hyperdizardicall discourse. For first he supposeth calme deuotion to consist in the Popish worship of Saints, which is proued to be a deuice full of superstition and impiety, and that hath drawen infinite numbers from God.

Secondly, he affirmeth, that we being drawen from the reuerend respect and deuotion to old Saints, doe now begin to thinke of new. Whereas we, although we reuerence the memories of holy men, yet condemne the Popish forme of worshipping Saints, whether they be old, or new.

Thirdly he compareth vs, that condemne the popish worship of saints, to the prodigall Child, Luke 15. who not content with his fathers intertainement, sought nouelties abrode, and thereby was driuen to such extremity, that he was forced to feed vpon huskes among hogges, and yet could not be satisfied. But the comparison is so vnlike, as Parsons the Iebusite is to Cowbucke the blacke smith. For we neither mislike our heauenly fathers intertainement at home, nor neede we to abandon the worship of one true and euerliuing God, to worship saints, nor are they driuen to any extremity, that cleaue to the seruice of one God, and leaue

the

the worship of saints, especially of the bogge saints, and bogge saints canonized lately by the Pope. This comparison therefore fitteth not his discourse against vs, but rather it fitteth vs against the Papists, who not trusting in the promises made to them by God through Christ, nor content with their heauenly fathers doctrine, runne out to the Pope, to seek new gods, and new formes of worship, and so by antichrist are brought to feede on the huskes of the Popes traditions, in stead of Gods word, that is the food of the soule, and for loue of huskes deliuered them by the lebusites the Popes swineheards, doe abandon the sincere doctrine of faith.

Fourthly, he would perswade vs to returne to worship saints by the example of the prodigall sonne, that said, I will rise, and goe to my father. But he may aswell proue worship of saints, by his Pater noster, which quite ouerthroweth the same, directing vs in our prayers to our heauenly father, and not to saints, as by the words of the prodigall sonne. For he saith not, I will goe to pray to saints, or my fathers seruants, but I will goe to my father, and say to him, father I haue sinned against heauen, and before thee. Parsons therefore very wisely cutteth off these last words, lest he might seem to condemn his owne consortes, which go not to their heauenly father, but to Angels, and saints, and to the whole host of heauen.

Fifthly, where our Sauiour Christ by the example of the prodigal child teacheth repentant sinners to returne to their heauenly father, Robert Parsons would haue them to returne to the church of Rome, which he calleth their mother. But it is a strange conuersion to turne father into mother, and an absurd conceit, to thinke the Church of Rome, that worshippeth saints, and other creatures to be the mother of Christians. She is rather the great mother of fornications, and of nere kinred to Parsons his mother the wife of the blacksmithes wife of Netherstoy.

Sixthly, he is an absurd fellow, to thinke, that the Pope is Lord of the Calendar. Let him, if he will, make him a sommer

sommer lord, and let Parsons attend on him like my Lordes cosen with a pointed cappe and a cockescombe in stead of a Cardinals hat. But neither did the ancient bishops of Rome euer take vpon thē to canonize saints, nor are the holy Apostles, and ancient Martyrs sainted by the Popes grace. And this the Greeke Church knoweth very well, that reuereneth many for saints not canonized by the Pope, whose authority they esteme not the weight of one daisy.

Seuenthly, neither are the Popes saints old, nor did we euer thinke but reuerently of the Apostles, Martyrs, and all Gods true saints. Only we do not allow the idolatrous worship giuē by Papists to fellowes canonized by the Pope, that giueth the title of saints to prophane and wicked men, and alloweth masses and offices said in their honor, and the burning of incense to their Images, and diuers other such like honours.

Eightly, he beareth his reader in hand, that the Catholike Church of al times hath worshipped saints after the popish manner: which is a most bold and impudent assertion, as I haue at large declared in my treatise against Bellarmine concerning the worship of saints: which if Parsons answer frō point to point, if the Pope will not giue him a hat, yet shall I bestow on him a cappe with the appurtenances.

Ninthly, speaking of the true Saints of Gods eternall church, as he calleth them, he telleth vs how Christ Apoca. 2. 3. 13. saith, that he hath placed them as victors in heauenly thrones of glory to be pillars vnto vs in this life. But if he proceed in this sort, and repent not himselfe of his intolerable and impudent lying, he mentioneth a place, whereto he shall neuer attaine. For as we reade Apocalyps. 22. Without shall be dogges and enchanters &c. and euery one that loueth or maketh lies. In the places alledged, our Sauiour neither speaketh of thrones of saints, nor saith they shall bee pillars vnto vs in this life. His words are only these: *Qui vicerit, dabo ei sedere in throno meo*; that is, to him that ouercommeth, wil I giue to sit in my throne; and again, him that ouercōmeth, wil I make a pillar in the tēple of my God. Further-

more

more he talketh of holy Martyrs that died for the testimony of his truth, and not of the Popes creatures and vassals that suffer for his sake.

Finally, Robert Parsons aduiseth his disciples (for I think he is not so mad as to tell vs these foleries) to reiect infamous patrons, and to embrace the Popes saints with due honour, reuerence and deuotion, vsing that worship and intercession to them, which Gods church hath euer allowed, and is but lawfull, and due vnto them, and profitable and obligatory to vs, and most honourable to Christ our Sauiour. And this he supposeth to be a sound counsell to him that desireth true peace and tranquillity of deuotion. But first he abuseth his reader, making him beleeue, that we make Saints our patrons. This is a bud of Popish heresie. Secondly, he wrongeth Christs Martyrs, charging them with infamy, himselfe being an infamous railer against those, whom his copartners haue cruelly murdred. Thirdly, he affirmeth, that with a breath, which neither he, nor any of his consorts shall euer be able to proue, viz. that the Popish worship of Saints is due vnto them, profitable to vs, and honourable to Christ. We haue by diuers arguments shewed the contrary. Lastly, this is a silly comfort for Christians to go to saints, of whose help they haue neither assurance nor promise. *Tutius & iucundius*, saith the author of the booke de visit. infirm. attributed to S. Augustine, *loquar ad meum Iesum, quam ad aliquem sanctorum spirituum Dei.* I doe more safely and delightfully speake to my Sauiour, then any one of the holy spirits of God.

But lest his credulous disciples should tread awry in the worship of saints as is very likely they do, treading so strange a path, he giueth them two limitations, assigned, as he saith, by Catholicke doctrine. The first, that benefits are asked of them, not as the authours and giuers thereof &c. but as intercessours only. The second, that saints are not our immediate intercessors to God, but by Christ and his merits only. But first the inuocation of saints is but one point of their worship. And therefore his doctrine and limits are very defectiue, telling

ling his scholars nothing of their canonization, of building Churches and altars, and saying Masses and offices in their honor, of swearing by their names and reliques, and of other points of their seruice. Secondly, we haue shewed elsewhere, that this doctrine of his is neither Catholike, nor Christian. Thirdly, these two limitations are manifestly false, and refuted by infinit examples in the missales and breuiaries, offices, and primars, wherein they do pray to saints, as giuers of graces, and come to God for the merits of saints, and not only by their intercession. they say, I confesse, *per dominum nostrum Iesum Christum*. But that is most absurd, and maketh Christ a mediator to saints. they interpret also these words, *miserere mei*, and *protege me*, as if they meant only, that saints should pray for merry and protection. But this is repugnant to grammar, and common praise of Papists, that take saints to be rulers of the world, and most sure patrons.

He doth also call them heretikes, and charge them with slander, that accuse the Papists for the impious worshipping of saints. But the councell of Laodicea doth condemne them for idolaters that pray to Angels; and he, albeit a cunning heretike, shall neuer answer the arguments brought against the Popish worship of saints. As for his word, it neither maketh Christians heretikes, nor truth slander. his two limitations are two poore shifts, not worth one rush.

In the end of his discourse he prescribeth certaine formes of praiers to be said on the feast of the Virgin Mary, of the Apostles, of Martyrs, of Bishops, of Confessors, of Doctors, of Virgins, of Angels, and seuerall sorts of Saints. But first he sheweth himselfe not wise, to prescribe formes of praiers to saints to vs, that not only mislike the thing it selfe, but the forme also. Secondly, these formes doe nothing fit his purpose. For all these praiers are directed to God and not to saints, beginning thus, *concede misericors deus*, and *deus qui nos*, and *exaudi nos deus*, and in such like sort, insomuch, as our aduersarie himselfe seemeth to condemne praiers to saints. Thirdly, the formes of these praiers, which he

he prescribeth, are very ridiculous and impious. For where he taketh on him to prescribe formes of prayers to saints, he maketh God an intercessor to saints, and not saints intercessors to God. As for example in this, *Concede misericors deus fragilitati nostræ præsidium, vt qui sancta dei genitricis memoriam agimus, intercessionis eius auxilio a nostris iniquitatibus resurgamus.* And againe, *vt B. N. martyris tui atque pontificis intercessio gloriosa nos protegat.* In the first he prayeth to God, that he may rise by our Ladies help. So God is to moue her to help him. In the second he requesteth at Gods hands the protection of a saint, as if God were to mediate with the saint for helpe. Fourthly, he prescribeth a most sottish forme of prayer. For he calleth not to saints for helpe, but desireth of God, that the celebration of this, or that saints feasts may increase in him deuotion, and saluation. *Da quæsumus*, saith he, *omnipotens deus, vt B. N. apostoli tui, quam præuenimus veneranda solemnitas, & deuotionem in nobis augeat & salutem.* Fiftly, he prayeth, that the intercession of saints may helpe him, and yet cannot tell, whether they intercede for him, nor doth so much as once request them to doe it. Sixthly, these are the least superstitious prayers, that Parsons could find out. But vnder colour of these, he endeuoureth to draw his clients to like of the rest, that are more impious, and blasphemous. Finally, these formes of prayer are no where found prescribed in scriptures, or practised by the Catholike Church. Was not then this our aduersary shameleſſe, in stæde of the Church Apostolicall to commend vnto vs this Apostatical congregation?

Finally to commend to his clients the Popish worship of saints, most desperatly he auoucheth, the same to be proued, first by the examples of the Patriarches, Prophets, and holy men before Christ. Next, by the testimony of Origen, Nazianzen, Ephrem, Gregory Nyssen, Chrysostome, Cyril, Sozomen, Theodoret, the councell of Chalcedon, Hilary, Ambrose, Hierome, Maximus, Ruffinus, Prudentius, Victor, Leo, and Bernard. He addeth also the testimony of Iosephus lib. 3. de bello Iudaic. c. 14. and Luther in an epistle ad Georgium

orgium Spalatinum. In summe, this shameleſſe fellow affirmeth, that the worſhippers of ſaints ſhall ioine with the deuotion and piety of all the moſt holy men and women, that euer haue liued vpon the earth ſince the planting of Chriſts Church or before. But whoſoeuer ſhall read my particular anſwer to all Bellarmines teſtimony, alledged by Bellarmine in this cauſe, and here cited by Parſons, ſhall eaſily diſcouer the folly and impudency of this bragging hacker. The ſame alſo appeareth in this, that he imagineth, that there was ſome time, when Chriſt had no Church vpon the earth. So he contenteth not himſelfe with corrupting of the Churches doctrine, but he will alſo ouerthrow the church for ſome time, and depriue Chriſt of his myſticall body. For preſent anſwer, this he may vnderſtand further, that he is an abſurd fellow to alledge the examples or teſtimonies of the Patriarches and Prophets vnder the law for praſe of praiers to ſaints, and their interceſſion to God. For he and his conſorts place them in limbo, where, as they ſay, they were depriued of the viſion of Gods face. Secondly, he dealeth wickedly in alledging Apocryphall writings, falſifying of the words of Fathers, and wreſting their words contrary to their meaning. Thirdly, he miſtaketh and miſalledgeth both ſcriptures and fathers moſt ignorantly, and childiſhly, and lieth without conſcience or ſhame. In the 2. of Paralip. 5. there is nothing to purpoſe. Dauid 1. paralip. 29. ſpeaketh not one word of interceſſion. Iacob Geneſ. 48. praieth not to an angel, but vnderſtandeth the ſonne of God. For that appeareth, for that he conioineth God and the Angell: the ſame is confirmed by the teſtimony of Athanaſius, orat. 4. contr. Arian. Cyrillus Alexandrin. Theſaur. lib. 3. and Procopius Gazeus in Geneſ. 48. Parſons he miſtaketh the place, and for 48. quoteth 41. Moyſes ſaying, *recordare domine &c.* that is, remember Lord thy ſeruants Abraham, Iſaac, and Iaacob; and Salomon, ſaying, Lord remember Dauid, pſ. 132. and Iſay 63. ſaying, turne to vs Lord for thy ſeruants: ſhew vs, that we are to pray to God, and not to ſaints. They doe alſo put God in mind of his couenant, and not of the merits of ſaints. Ci-

ting the 13. of Hester, he nameth Hester for Mardochey, and belieth her, saying, that she prayed by the intercession of Abraham; for Mardochey said only, O Lord, and King, the God of Abraham, be mercifull to thy people. If he should indevour to overthrow prayers to saints, he could not bring more pregnant places.

Origens lamentation, and the discourse of Cyprians pennance are apocryphall writings, as Gelasius testifieth, c. sancta Romana, dist. 15. Beside that, the authour of the lamentation alledged, doth manifestly declare himselfe to be an Arian. Baronius also in his Annals reiecteth the narration of Cyprians practise in art Magicke. *Explosa fabula illa de Cypriani arte magica*, saith he, an. 250. Cyprian also by Parsons is misnamed for Iustina. The testimony of Ephrem, Nectarius, Chrysostome in homil. in natal. Apost. and in his Liturgie, are counterfet. Nay, we do not find that Nectarius wrote an oration in Theodorum Martyrem. It seemeth this blind bettle misseke him for Nyssenus, that indeed is said to haue written such an oration. Beside that, both these, and Nyssenus, and Nazianzene do rather vse figuratiue alloquutions, then prayers to Saints. So also Orators do speake to men absent, and to things without sense. Of the councell of Chalcedon he lieth desperatly. For not Cyril, nor the councell of Chalcedon, but certaine clerkes of Constantinople, say, *Flavianus pronobis oret*, and not as Parsons hath written, *exorat*. Hierom prayeth not deuoutly to Hilarion, and Paula, as this prophane forger falsely affirmeth; but as an orator writing orations in their prayses turneth his speech vnto them. Paulinus and Prudentius, as Poets vse figuratiue apostrophes. But suppose their speeches were to be expounded literally; yet there is great difference betwixt Poets and masters of religion. Paulinus in Natal. 2. Felicis calleth him a God: which is not to be defended but by Poeticall licence.

Ignorantly Claudianus Fortunatus is cited for Venantius Fortunatus, and the liues of Celsus and Felix, for certaine poore verses written in their memory. Gregorius Turonensis is a writer of Legends of small credit; and yet no doubt, but many

many tales are added to his. Gregory and Bede say little for the forme of praiers to Saints now practised. Ancient Litanies were directed to God, and not to Saints. These words: *Solo Deo creatore adorato inuocet Christianus sanctos*, are imprudently thrust into a canon of the 6. synode, and are not found either in the Greeke edition, or old Latine copies. Bernard wrot in the darkenesse of Popery; yet can it not be proued, that he allowed the formes of Popish praiers now vsed. Maximus, Hilary, Ruffinus, Augustine and Leo are only named by Parsons, and say nothing for him. Iosephus his words lib. 3. de bel. Iud. c. 14. are falsified. For he hath not these words, *pura anime que exaudiuntur inuocantes*, but *pura autem, & que inuocantes exaudiantur*. But of his lies and falsifications he shall heare more anon.

Finally, M. Luther, as he allowed praiers to saints, not seeing al the errors of popery at once; so he allowed also at the first both the Masse and the Popes authority. But from all these God deliuered him afterward. If then Parsons will proue vs his popish worship of saints, he must conclude more strongly, and bring vs more authenticall testimonies of Fathers.

CHAP. IIII.

The nature and reason of Calendars, and therein of the Calendar prefixed before M. Foxes *booke of Acts and Monuments, and of* Robert Parsons *his friuolous cauils against it.*

THe first chapter of Parsons his examen is principally directed against the Calendar set before M. Foxes booke of acts and monuments. Therein also he endeuoureth further to shew his great sight in Calendars. but neither is his skill great in these matters, being not able to translate that into English, which Baronius and Molanus had before him written in Latin, albeit he, like an impudent thiefe doth not

once acknowledge, whence he had his stollen stuffe: nor doth he almost speake one word truly, either of M. Fox or that calendar. For first the Calendar was not deuised by M. Fox himselfe, as Parsons often reporteth, but by him, that had the ouersight of the print. Secondly, it was neither M. Foxes, nor the author of the Calendar his intention, to prescribe the same, as a forme to the Church of England, nor could they doe it, if they would. Thirdly, they doe not take vpon them to make saints, which Master Fox imputeth, as a tricke of Antichristian pride to the Pope, that taketh on him to create new saints from time to time, neither to record all as saints, which are there set downe; but only to frame a briefe table of Martyrs, and others mentioned in the body of the booke, with some note of the times of their trialles or troubles. Fourthly, they doe not appoint festiuall daies for them, nor put them in the Calendar to be worshipped, nor place them in heauen, as Parsons saith; but only for the causes aboue mentioned. If the printer haue added some forme like to other calendars, or distinguished in colours some from other, we would pray Mas Parsons not to be angrie with him, being master of his own trade, as his putatiue father was of the trade of blacke smithes. Fifthly, they offer no wrong either to ancient Martyrs, or other holy men not mentioned in this Calendar. for this was a direction only for this booke, and they stand mentioned in other bookes and calendars, albeit not to be there worshipped. Sixthly, it is no disgrace either to the Apostle Saint Paul, or to Timothy, and the auncient Martyrs, if Master Tyndall, Master Frith, the reuerend fathers, and holy Martyrs, Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Ridley, Bishop Hooper, and other graue prelates, and most constant Martyrs be resembled in some sort vnto them. For as they taught christian religion & defended it against Pagans; so did these holy Martyrs against the supposes of Antichrist. As they suffered death for the maintenance of the faith against the Pagan Emperours and their complices; so did these suffer for mainteining truth against the slaues and vassals of the whore of Babylon. Both of them therefore de-

serue

serue to be praised for their rare piety, trauels, & sufferings for the defence of the faith. Neither doe we like them the worse: for that as Parsons saith, now a posterity of the English nation doth defie and detest them. For they doe not more detest these godly Martyrs, then the Iewes and Pagans did detest and defie the holy Apostles of Christ, and his ancient Martyrs. Neither are we to account them either a true race of English, that haue combined themselues with forreine enemies; or true Christians, that haue sworne themselues slaues to the whore of Babylon. What then if such bastardly fellowes, as Parsons, or such blind harpers as Harpesfeld, and other Apostates and sworne vassals of Antichrist should raile against godly Martyrs. should any man therefore mislike that true religion, which they professed, and which the Pope with all his gunpowder men and adherents haue oppugned; or should any man mislike the professors of truth for the malice & hatred the enemies therof beare vnto it? Finally, where M. Fox preferreth late martyrs before the popes creatures canonized by him, and put into the calendar, he doth therein nothing but right, and reason; considering the piety of the one, and the superstition and errors of the other.

Where he talketh of Calendars, he runneth out into diuers exorbitant discourses; and sheweth, that he hath a deeper sight into a can of Ale, then into the nature and reason of Calendars. First then, he telleth, how he hath set forth the moderne Romish church to the eye, and how he hath sought for our Church, and could not find it. But for the first, if he had Argus his eies, he could neuer see the forme of the Romish Church now, nor find it, so many ages after Christ. Antiquity certes neuer saw either such a head as the Pope, or such members as Cardinals, Halfe-priests, Monkes, and Friers. The Iebusites were lately borne of the whore of Babylon, about the yeare 1540. Neither was the decretaline and schole diuinity knowen in ancient time. As for the second, we professe and confesse our selues to be of the Apostles Church, and the Church of the primitiue Martyrs: and so should Papists be, if they would renounce their heresies,

and decretaline doctrine, and returne to the ancient faith.

Secondly, he telleth, that Martyrologe is deriued from the Greek, and Calendar from the Latin. Yet his knowledge in Greeke is no course, as sowtage, and in Latine not very excellent. Macrob. saturn. li. 1. c. 15. sheweth, that calendę whence calendarium is deriued, commeth from the Greeke word καλῶ, which is Greeke I trow, & not Latine. He telleth vs also a tale of Appius Cæcus; as if Cæcus had beene his surname, and not Claudius, and saith that Ephemeris is Greeke for a Calendar, and that Almanack is one with calendar. But the first sheweth his ignorance in Latine, the second in Greeke (for that which the Latins call Calendarium, they, of the moneth, call μὴνολόγιον) the third argueth his want of skill in his owne argument. For as the Romish Calendar respecteth the distinction of feasts and other daies, so doth the almanack respect the difference of times and seasons.

Thirdly, to giue vs a taste of his skill in defining, he defineth the Martyrologe to be nothing else, but a certaine short and compendious relation of the names, sufferings, deathes and passions of Martyrs or witnesses in Christian religion, (he should haue said, of Christian religion) with the times and daies thereof, and some breefe notice of the occasion, as also of the persecutors. and that Calendar signifieth nothing els but a catalogue or ecclesiasticall table conteining the order and disposition of the said Martyrs and saints names according to the moneths and daies wherein they suffered, and wherein their memories are to be celebrated by the Church. But while he went about to define, he hath made a pretty breefe catalogue of his owne fallshoods and foleries. For first in the Martyrologe many saints are set downe without names, as for example the 40. Martyrs, the 7. sleepers, the 20 thousand Martyrs, and such like members. Secondly, their sufferings, and deathes are not alwaies mentioned. Thirdly, not only Martyrs are set down in the Martyrologies, but also diuers creatures, and vassals of the Pope, that neuer were Martyred. Fourthly, the Popes saints were neither witnesses in, nor of Christian religion, but of the Popes traditions, contrary for

the

the most part to Christian religion. Fiftly in these Martyrologies is set down Peters chaire, and the invention of the crosse, which Parsons, I hope, wil not saie were Martyred. Sixthly, seldome are the times and daies either expressed, or rightly expressed. 7. the names of Martyrs are not alwaies expressed in the calendar. 8. there is great error in the moneths and daies. 9. diuers that were no Martyrs are there set downe, yet sometimes they celebrate the feast of chaires, or crosses, or sacraments, that were neither Martyrs, nor saints, nor men. Finally, not the Church, but the Pope hath ordered all these matters.

Thirdly, he sheweth, that the Church by the speciall instinct of the holy Ghost had a speciall care to gather Martyrs names, and to write their actions, and to note the daies and places of their sufferings. After that he telleth, how the Church laid vp those ecclesiasticall legends, and sacred relations. but if this were done by the instinct of the holy ghost, then should legends be equall to canonicall scriptures. Further it is not likely, if this were done by the holy ghost, that the names and actes of so many Martyrs should be lost, as are. Thirdly, we find the daies and places of Martyrs sufferings to haue bene seldome noted. Lastly, if this care had proceeded from the holy ghost, and bene committed to the Church, it is not likely, that the legends would haue bene so full of lies and foleries.

To shew the Churches diligence in collecting the names and actes of Martyrs, he alledgeth the testimony of Eusebius lib. 4. & 5. concerning the Churches of Smyrna, Vienna, and Lyon, of Pontius, Cyprians Deacon, of Damasus in vita Clementis and Fabiani, who saith, they appointed notaries for this purpose; of Cyprian epist. 37. who speaketh of noting certaine daies, of Tertullian de coron. milit. who, as he saith, calleth the Church festiuals fastos ecclesiasticos. Of Paulinus in vita Ambrosij, who saith, that himselfe was vnder the care of Castus Diaconus, to write, and record all things exactly of the Church of Millan. But here he committeth as many errors almost, as he writeth lines. For Euse-

but noteth it as a thing singular, that certaine Churches did mention the names of some Martyrs, and these acts he saith not were laid vp in records, but onely sheweth they were mentioned in some letters, and as appeareth by them, vpon some speciall occasion. Pontius in vita Cypriani hath not these words, *vt ad nostram quoque notitiam, qui nondum nati fumus perueniret.* Neither is that relation authenticall. For therein we find mention made of those, which liued long after Pontius the Deacon. Damasus his pontificall deserueth no credit, being a meer peece of patchery set out vnder his name. But were it that Clement and Fabian had vsed notaries to record the names and acts of Martyrs: yet are those records no where to be found. Cyprian speaketh only of certaine confessors of his church, that died in prison. He doth not shew, that the matter was generall, neither now are those notes of his remaining, to be shewed. Tertullian neither nameth ecclesiasticall tables, nor *fastos ecclesiasticos*, but only *fastos*, and by them he vnderstandeth the registers of Heauen, and not ecclesiasticall calendars. *Noster inquit, mancipatus es cœlis: habes tuos census, tuos fastos. Nihil tibi cum gaudijs seculi.* Paulinus that wrot the life of Ambrose is an egregious fallary. But had he wrot truth; yet he saith nothing of writing the acts of the Church of Milan. Finally were this the practise of some three or foure churches, to record the names and acts of Martyrs; yet doth not this shew, that the practise was generall, nor that the Martyrs were recorded to be worshipped.

To excuse the losse of many Martyrs names and actions, he telleth vs out of Eusebius lib. 8. c. 2. & 3. as he saith, that Diocletian defaced all ecclesiastical bookes and monuments. But this is a shameleſſe practise, where Eusebius speaketh of burning of scriptures, to turne it to the defacing of legends. Againe, this maketh against the Papists, who burne holy scriptures translated into vulgar languages, as Diocletian did in time past.

For proofe of the antiquity of Calendars he alledgeth Macrobius saturnal. lib. 1. But this sheweth, how they borrow the

the antiquity of their calendars from the Gentiles. By the same also they may prove both the worship of saints, and Images, and of Apollo and Iupiter.

This being the beginning of calendars he telleth vs, that after the old Roman Martyrologe followed that of S. Hierome, and after him another of Beda, and after them others of Florus, Vsuardus, Wandelbertus, and Ado of Treues. he might also haue added Iames de Voragine, Petrus de Natalibus, Baronius his anales Fabulę, Surius, Lipomanus, and other authors of Spanish, Italian, French, Dutch and English Legends. For all be of one quality, except Hierome whose Martyrologe is lost. What Ado of Treues saith, Parsons cannot tell, seeing he was neuer printed, vnlesse that he be that is set out by Lipomanus a fabler. Bedes Martyrologe is corrupted, as Molanus c. 3. de Martyrologijs testifieth. *Notandum est*, saith he, *nos non habere purè ipsum Beda Martyrologium.* The same he confesseth also of Vsuardus, and may be proued both of him and others, because in them, saints are mentioned, that liued since their times, and for that there are diuers contrarieties & repugnances betweene the copies.

Against heretickes he maketh a long speake, for that they vsed diuers shifts and arts to obscure the catholicke calendar, as he saith. But he telleth of a thing neuer heard of hitherto. He saith Epiphanius doth testifie so much, hæres. 30. 26. and 47. But he dealeth with him, as his maner is to deale with others, that is, falsely and lewdly. For of the Ebionites he saith hær. 30. ý they corrupted the Gospell of S. Matth. Of the Gnostiks hær. 26. that they wrote other Gospels in the name of the Apostles. Speaking of the Encratites hæres. 47. *Vtuntur*, saith he, *scripturis priuatis, quæ dicuntur Andreæ & Ioannis actiones, item Thomæ.* Neither did the Manichees, and Priscillianists corrupt Legends of Saints, but the Gospell. May the Papists then thinke Parsons a good Christian, that could not distinguish legends from the Gospell, or at the least compareth false Martyrologies, with the gospell? He alledgeth Augustine lib. de fid. contr. Manich. and Philaster, and Cyril, and Orosius, to proue the fraud of heretickes in corrupting the

acts

acts of Martyrs. But S. Augustine hath nothing to his purpose: Philastr and Cyril are cited at large. Orosius never wrote a booke to S. Augustine, de errore Priscillianistarum.

But grant we, that the acts of Martyrs haue bene corrupted by heretickes, this maketh nothing against M. Fox, that was neither hereticke, nor corrupter of Martyrs acts, as we haue shewed; but it is, as it were, a knife to cut the throates of Parsons and his owne consorts. For what doth he striue for but to corrupt and disgrace the acts of Martyrs? Again, what is the Lombardicall history, the Romish breuiary and Martyrologe, Baronius his Annals and other Legends, but a corruption of the history of the Church, and a packe of lies and fables, sometime of supposed, sometime of true Martyrs. Against them therefore, and not against M. Fox, is the 63. canon of the sixth Councell, forbidding counterfet histories of Martyrs to be read, directed.

To proue, that it is a tricke of heretickes, to oppose Martyrs to Martyrs, he alledgeth the words of Apollinaris, as he saith, Euseb. hist. lib. 5. c. 15. But the idiot mistooke both the man, and his whole purpose. For it was not Apollinaris that uttered those words, but another. Neither did that man talke of any opposition of Martyrs to Martyrs. He addeth also, that heretickes bragge of their Martyrs, and of their resolution. But constancy in Christs cause is a vertue, and no property of heretikes. Neither doth it any thing concerne M. Fox, if heretiks either oppose Martyrs to Martyrs, or brag of their Martyrs. For he opposeth not his Martyrs, against the ancient Martyrs of the church, nor did he brag of them, but giue God thankes for them. But the Papists indeed oppose Martyrs to Martyrs, and this is the end of Parsons his double Calendar. They also bragge of their Martyrs, and in respect of the Popes vassals contemne all others. Nay albeit their late supposed saints died for rebellion and treason, and attempts against the state; yet will Papists haue them honoured as Martyrs, and holy Saints. We may therefore say of them, as Augustine said of the Donatistes. *Vinebant vt latrones, honorabantur vt Martyres.* They liued as theeues

theeues, and assassins, and by their consorts are honoured as Martyrs.

Finally, he falleth into an extrauagant discourse of English Saints and Martyrs, as he calleth them, and namely, of Bertuinus, Boniface with his 50. companions, Wolstane and his fellowes, of S. Edmund, S. Edward, Elphege, Thomas Becket, More, Fisher, Whiting, Houghton, Webster, Reinolds, and in our late Queenes daies, of Maine, Woodhouse, Sherwin, Briant, Ford, Hart, and such like. But first there is no comparison betwixt the ancient Martyrs, that died for Christs Gospell, and these slaues of Antichrist, that of late time haue died in his quarrell. Secondly, there is no small difference betwixt these fugitiue traitors, that in the late Queenes raigne fled to forren enemies, and returned againe to practise against the prince and state; and those godly Martyrs that suffered in Queene Maries raigne for the testimony of the truth. These died for treason and practising; those were not so much as once charged with any disloyalty. 3. Neither was Wolstane, by Capgrave called Wistane, nor Edward, nor Edmũd, nor Elphege, nor Becket martyrs. For they died for temporall causes. But whatsoeuer they are to be accompted, neither they, nor Boniface, and those that were with him died for like cause, as did Campian and his fellowes, nor did they know the doctrine of the conuenticle of Trent. If then M. Fox left them out of the catalogue of true Martyrs, he did them no wrong. But had he made other accompt of them then he doth; little do they make for Parsons his cause, seeing they neither defended the worship of Saints, nor the rest of the moderne Popish heresies, which we refuse.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Parsons his idle talke concerning the making of Calendars and honours giuen in time past to Martyrs, is examined.

TWo things by Parsons are proposed in the title of the second chapter of his examen. The first is a declaration of the causes moving the ancient Christian Church to keepe a Calendar of saints feasts. The second is a particular of the honors vsed in time past towards saints. But in the first he abuseth his reader, speaking confusedly of saints. For the ancient Church did make a great difference betwixt Martyrs, and other Christians. He doth also deliuer therein a grosse vntruth. For not the ancient Christian Church, but the late Romish apostaticall Synagogue began the order of calendring the feasts of saints, which is now obserued by the Papists. Parsons if he were to fast vntill such time, as he should bring forth a precedent for the calendar of saints feasts for a thousand yeares after Christ, would be sory, that euer he made mention of saints feasts.

In the second he spendeth many words either to no purpose, or else against himselfe, his owne friendes, and cause. For whatsoeuer ancient fathers speake of martyrs, the same belongeth nothing to the Saints canonized by the Pope and all those honors which antiquity gaue to Martyrs, doe confound Parsons and his cause. For albeit they did celebrate their memories assembling at their monuments, and rehearsing their names in the celebration of the eucharist, and that not only to stirre vp others to imitate them, but also to declare the fellowship, which Christians had with them; yet that is nothing to the honors, which Papists giue both to Martyrs, and to other saints. For they put them in a catalogue, to be called vpon, and worshipped. They build temples and altars vnto them. They say Masses, and seruice in their honor, they erect Images vnto them, and fall downe

before

before them, and burne incense vnto them. They confesse their sinnes vnto them, and publikely and priuatly call vpon them, as their patrons and intercessors. They sweare by their names, and make vowes vnto them. They digge their bones out of the earth, and put them in altars and vpon altars. Finally they build costly shrines vnto them, and worship them almost all alike as the Gentiles did their benefactors.

Seing then Robert Parsons cannot proue these honors to haue bene giuen either to all saints or all Martyrs by the ancient fathers, al his labour serueth to no other purpose, but to shew that the Romish church in the worship of saints is departed from the ancient Catholike church.

He citeth S. Augustine serm. 44. and 47. de sanctis. But the sermons are counterfet. beside that, the author of them doth only mention the solemnities kept in honour of Martyrs. But what is that either to Popish saints, or the Popish worship of them.

Saint Augustine lib. 20. contr. Faustum. c. 21. doth mention the memories of Martyrs celebrated to stirre vp others to imitation, and to make them haue fellowship with their workes or merits, and help by their praiers.

But that is nothing to the Popes stinking saints, nor doth it follow therefore, that we are to pray to them, because their works are set before vs to follow, and their praiers helpe the church in generall.

Ambrose ser. de sanctis Nazario et Celso, & ser. 91. de Gerualio et Protasio, if those sermons were his, doth bring an argument from these Martyrs to proue the faith. So doth also Gregory homil. 27. in Euangel. But what is this to the papish worship of new made saints? Nay, if we are to professe no other faith, then that, which ancient Martyrs professed, as Ambrose signifieth serm. 9. then is the faith of Papists no true faith, that is so different from the doctrine of Martyrs.

In a certaine epistle of Gregory to Eulogius lib. 7. ep. 29. there is mention made of Martyrs names distinguished

by

by daies, and gathered into one book, and of Masse said in their honor. but the words are contrary to the authors intention, and crept out of the margent, as it seemeth, into the text. For in the same epistle the author saith, he had no memorial of these matters. Beside that, all that which he saith, concerneth Martyrs, and no canonized popish saints.

Saint Augustine lib. 20. contr. Faust. c. 21. doth not say, *sacrificare deo in memorias Martyrum*, as the falsary Parsons saith, but *in memorijs Martyrum*. That is, at the tombes or monuments of Martyrs. He doth not talke of the Masse, nor speake one word of Popish worship of saints, or of Popish saints.

Likewise he citeth other places out of Augustine, Cyprian, Tertullian, Origen, Ambrose and Chrysostome: but he is able to proue out of them nothing, but this, that the names of Martyrs were remembred in the celebration of the holy eucharist, as Christians of our communion, and such as prayed for the whole Church. But all this is from the purpose of Parsons, that taketh vpon him to proue those honours to be due to all the saints in the Popes calendar, which the Popish sect doth giue vnto them. Beside this, he iumbleth Apocryphall writings with the fathers testimonies, and hardly is able to name the titles of the bookes, which he citeth, rightly.

Hauing alledged diuers texts of fathers he concludeth, that their vse, practise, impugnation, defence, faith, religion and cause, was all one with the vse, practise, impugnation, defence, faith, religion and cause of Papists. He meaneth in the worship of saints. But I haue placed two barres before him, which he shall neuer be able to remoue. The first is, that Papists giue diuers honors to saints, which are neither mentioned by the fathers, nor proued by him. The second is, that they giue that honour to Monkes, Friars, and others canonized by the Pope, that in ancient time was only giuen to Martyrs.

Thus is Parsons come to the end of his rolle, yet could not the vice depart quietly from off the stage, but he would needes giue M. Foxe one blow or two with his wooden dagger. First he

he ſaith, that Iohn Fox and his followers dare not ſtand to it, that his Martyrs are true Martyrs. A matter very abſurd and ridiculous. For both he and others haue too often ſpoken the word, to deny it, or to goe backe from it now. Neither is it materiall, that ſome mentioned by him, are denied to be Martyrs. For he taketh vpon him to write the hiſtory of the Church, wherein although principally he treate of Martyrs; yet diuers vpon occaſion are there mentioned that are no Martyrs. Which if the Calendar doe name as Martyrs, it was not his fault, either in the firſt publication, or in the reuiew of his booke, he referring that matter to the corrector, who was not ſo wary, as he ſhould, hauing to doe with Copus, Parſons and ſuch cauillers.

Secondly, he goeth about to proue, that Maſter Fox meant to canonize all ſet downe in his calendar for Martyrs. And why ſo? Becauſe, ſaith he, either he thinketh them to be true-lie Martyrs, or not. And if he doe, then doth he canonize them. I anſwere (for this argument is principally againſt me) making the like dilemma againſt Parſons. That either he doth thinke the Martyrs and Confeſſors ſet down by him to be true Martyrs and Confeſſors, or not. If he doe, then doth he canonize them. And by a good conſequent for want of a more formall election, he maketh himſelfe Pope. Doe you not then thinke this fellow had drunke deepe, when he wrot this? As for Maſter Fox he hath yet a better defence for himſelf then Parſons. For neither did he collect the names ſet downe in the calendar himſelfe, nor was he ignorant, that the cauſe of Martyrs ſufferings, and their death for the confeſſion of Chriſts goſpell, was the thing that made them Martyrs, and not the Popes act, or decretale, taking vpon him to regiſter ſaints in heauen, when he himſelfe is often Calendred in hell, and a man ignorant of heauenly matters. We may ſaie alſo, that if Maſter Fox had neuer ſaid word, yet the holy Martyrs, that ſuffered for the truth in Queene Maries time, ſhould haue beene true Martyrs; and ſo ſhall be, though Parſons burſt with barking againſt them.

Thirdly, he accuſeth Maſter Fox for defacing ancient re-

cords,

cords, where the true causes of ech heretikes apprehension, examination and condemnation are expressed vnder the hands of many witnesses. But as he cleareth his aduersary not being able to charge him with any particular, and much lesse to proue it against him; so he sheweth himselfe to be an ignorant dolt in the matters, wherein he pretendeth skill. For as the causes of euery mans apprehension are not expressed in record; so the examinations of the parties are onlie testified by the registers hand. and this he should know by his owne experience, seeing neither the causes of his conuention in Bayliol colledge, nor his examinations appeare in record, but only an act of his confession, resignation and expulsion.

Finally, he saith, that ancient fathers haue left in writing rare things of the saints and Martyrs of his Church, and that our Martyrs haue no such thing recorded of them by M. Fox. But first they are not to be honoured as fathers, that haue written the legends of saints liues, being most lying and false companions, and writing without all conscience or care of telling truth. Secondly, they tell no rare, but rather rascall things and fables of their saints. Whereas M. Fox had respect to truth, and to that only. And yet albeit he hath not reported any rare miracles of Martyrs, yet he hath brought many examples of rare perfidiousnesse, falshood and crueltie practised by the persecutors.

CHAP. VI.

A briefe reiection of Parsons *his notorious lies and slanders exam. c. 3. concerning 9. supposed sects, vnto which he endeuoureth to referre true Christians.*

Although any man may see throughout the whole course of Parsons his libels and discourses, that he hath little shame, lesse conscience, and no care what he vttreth, so he may bring his aduersaries into obloquy and slander; yet doeth

doeth the same appeare most clearly in the third chapter of his examen, where he talketh of 9. sorts or sects of Christians, by him called heretiks, as to wit, the Waldensians, Albigensians, Wickleffians, Lollardes, Lutherans, Anabaptists, Zuinglians, Caluinists and Puritans. These nine sorts of sects and sectaries saith he, doe seeme to Fox and his mates, as the nine orders of Angels to vs for our direction. Thus writeth this shamelesse sectary, and false Friar, in lying and slandring pulling diuers of his mates, and comming nere to the exorbitant malice of the Diuell, and his Angels. For first, among vs the Anabaptists are generally reputed heretikes. Secondly, the other sorts, which he mentioneth, are but diuers names of the same Christians opposite to the popish faction, and by the same nicknamed to bring them into hatred with the people. Thirdly these men, which he misnameth for maintaining any thing defended, and taught by vs, will neuer be proued heretikes, nor yet for other matters, if their aduersaries would deale with them truely and sincerely. Fourthly those, whom these railing Friars, which are diuided into as many sects, as there be rules, and orders, doe call sometimes Wickleffians, sometime Lollardes, sometime Lutherans, sometime Zuinglians, sometime other names, doe neither follow Wickeleffe, nor Luther, nor Zuinglius, nor any man whatsoeuer, further then he teacheth the doctrin of the Prophets and Apostles of Christ Iesus. Finally all these names are but railing termes deuised by wicked heretikes to busie mens heads, and to withdraw Christians from the search of truth.

For answer to as much of his discourse, as any way may seeme materiall, we say, that all these whom he would diuide into sects, except the Anabaptists, of whom we doe not talke, do maintaine one truth, vnlesse it be, that some of them approch nearer to the errors of Papists, then others. Neither is it materiall, what either Aeneas Syluius, or the abbat of Vrsperg, or Antonius, or Vincentius, or such prating and railing companions as Prateolus, Sanders, Bernard of Luzemburg, and such like Popish parasites, and professed enemies of the truth, doe speake against them. For neither the Lawes of

God nor man admitte enemies for witnesses. And little hope there is of truth at their hands, that speake for hope of reward. What will not Monkes, Friars, and the popish faction deuise for maintenance of their Antichristian Kingdome?

Two things there are further to be noted, which may bewray the falshood and trecherie of their accusers. First, the accusations against the Albigensians, Waldensians, and the rest, are for the most part taken out of the articles obiected against them by their aduersaries, and most of them deuised after the death of the parties accused. This is proued by the articles obiected against Wickleffe in the conuenticle of Constance, and by diuers things now deuised daily against Luther, Caluin, Zuinglius, and others, whereof the very aduersaries neuer durst accuse them, while they liued. Secondly, they are so absurd and improbable, that he must be very credulous, that shall beleeue, that they held any such matter. As for example, against the Waldensians they obiect, that they reiected the Creed of the Apostles: against the Albigensians, that they beleeued, that there were two Creators, and denied the resurrection of the body. They accuse Wickleffe for teaching that God must obey the Diuell. They say, that the Lollards held, that Lucifer was wrongfully put out of heauen. They affirme of Luther, that he beleeued that the adultery of Dauid and treason of Iudas were as much the work of God, as the vocation of S. Paul. Against Zuinglius they haue deuised, that he taught, that man by force of naturall vertues might gaine eternall life. And against Caluin, that he should teach, that God is the authour of sinne and wickednesse. The which points are so contrary to their doctrine and profession, and so absurd, that he must hold them to be void of reason and vnderstanding, that beleeueth that they taught, or held any such damnable opinions.

Nay such is the folly of our aduersaries, that while they seeke to charge vs with heresie, they condemne that in vs, which they hold to be Catholicke doctrine in themselues. Peter Lombard and the schoolemen teach, that the diuine essence neither doth engender, nor is engendred. And yet the Papists

pists condemne Caluin for saying, that Christ is αὐτόθεον, whereby he meaneth nothing else, but that the diuine essence in the sonne is not engendred of the essence of his father. In the Puritans pag. 147. Parsons maketh it heresie, to beleeue, that temporall Princes may not by Gods law haue supreme authority in the Church, or that the Prince may be punished or deposed, though few of them hold these errors. And yet this is the common doctrine of Papists. Onely in this they differ, that Papists giue all authority in ecclesiasticall causes to the Pope; and others to the presbytery. May Parsons in his booke of titles proueth, that the people hath power sometimes to depose Kings. And that is also the doctrine of William Rosse.

So much also lying is pleasing vnto him, that sometime he lieth vpon no occasion. As for example, where he setteth downe articles, wherein the Waldensians differ from vs, and the Papists, he saith they condemned the religion of the mendicant friars, as an inuention of the Diuell. as if we in this point did ioine with the Papists, or else did allow these roguing vagabounds, or take their order to be good inuention?

If then Parsons purpose to winne credit to himselfe, and his cause, he must not alleadge the testimony of his consorts, and such light fellowes as Sanders, Rishton, Bolsecke, Staphylus, Petrus Caroli, and the men of Constance, and Trent: but the bookes, writings and confessions of the parties accused out of good record. And if not, then it will appeare, that his accusations are grounded on malice, and deuoid of truth. In the meane while he seemeth not wise to obiect diuisions and sects to vs, that are cleare of them; his owne consorts being diuided into diuers sects of Monkes and Friars, are not only diuers, but also opposite one to another.

CHAP. VII.

Parsons *his cauils against the constancy of* Christian *Martyrs suffering for the defence of truth against the* Papists.

SUch is the rage and malice of Parsons against the truth, that he can neither abide them, nor their vertues. Here in the fourth chapter of his examen he termeth their constancy and patience in suffering, nothing else but temerity and madnesse. It is maruell also, that he findeth no fault with them for professing the name of Christ, and beleeuing in him. He may doe the one certes, as well as the other, considering that their constancy proceeded from true faith in Christ Iesus.

To speake nothing of his malice or rather madnesse, let vs examine his dispute, and answer his cauils. First he discourseth of impauidity. But what is that to them, that neither wanted the true feare of God, nor the due respect, that is due to superiors? Againe, if he would shew the quality of it, he must bring better grounds then the authority of Thomas Aquinas, and Aristotle, who are but of small credit in matters of Diuinity. Secondly he talketh of the pertinacy of heretikes. But if he meant either to haue charged vs or to haue discharged his owne fellowes; he should haue shewed, that we are heretikes, and his owne consorts not. Thirdly he talketh idly of the obstinacy of Macarius and Polychronius. But absurdly he compareth Christians to Polychronius an obstinat Monke, and to Macarius a wicked heretike. Especially seing heresie cannot be separated from obstinacy, as Augustine sheweth; and none of them euer shewed himselfe obstinate, if he might see the truth proued to him out of scriptures. Fourthly he alledgeth certaine words out of Gregory 31. moral. c. 31. which are not there to be found, and out of Augustine lib. 4. contr. Donatist. c. 6. that make not to his purpose. Finally whatsoeuer is by him obiected against

against true Martyrs, the same may with farre better reason be laid to the charge of his owne consorts. For wanting the feare of God, and the respect of Princes authority they haue hazarded their neckes for the Pope. They are also as wilfull, as the Monke Polychronius or the heretike Macarius. their opinions they hold with obstinacy, and are by the ancient Church condemned for heresies. Finally they cleaue to the popes determination, and refuse to submit themselues either to scriptures, or fathers.

But saith Parsons pag. 172. what reason could there be that such people should preferre their owne iudgements, or of some few of their particular masters before the iudgement and learning of the whole body of Christendome? But talking of reason the fellow seemeth to want both reason, and sense. For if he had either, he might see, that these holy Martyrs did not rely vpon either the iudgement of a few of their teachers, or their owne. For the doctrine, for which they died, was the doctrine of the Apostles and primitiue Church, and neuer oppugned by any, but the late hereticall Papists.

He telleth vs also of foure sorts of men in king Henry the eight his daies put to death for religion. The first confessing the reall presence, the second denying it, the third holding this point indifferent, the fourth Anabaptists. But of Anabaptists he hath no reason to speake, considering that their errors were first condemned by vs. Secondly, it appeareth not, that there was any such difference betwixt M. Barnes, Gerrard, and Frith concerning the reall presence in the sacrament, as he supposeth. Thirdly, this difference is not so great, but that there are many as great among the Papists. Fourthly, if all the ancient saints and Martyrs, that did not consent positiuely in al points of religion were not to be esteemed true saints and Martyrs, as he imagineth; then would Parsons make a bare calendar.

Finally he goeth about to espie some differences betwixt the Martyrs, that suffered in Quen Maries daies. But we haue shewed, that those differences concerned not matters of faith, but rather questions of Romish schole diuinity, that might well rest vnknowen to Christians.

Wherefore vnlesse Parsons can shew, that these holy Martyrs died for other cause, then for the true faith of Christ, as their resolution shall alwaies be accompted Christian constancy; so shall their death and suffring be reputed true Martyrdom.

CHAP. VIII.

A Calendar of Parsons *his grosse lies, and false allegations of authors conteined throughout his examen.*

THus haue we passed ouer Parsons his examen of Calendars, matters that doe not concerne him very much, seeing, I thinke, he hath no hope to be canonized by his holy father. Let vs therefore now begin a new forme of Calendar, and shore vp his grosse lies, false allegations, foleries, arguments making against himselfe, railing termes, and such like flowers and figures of his rhetoricall discourse. Which if he regard his owne reputation, cannot chuse, but touch him nerely.

In the front of his booke he hath two allegations, but both falsified, and falsely applied. *Audent*, saith Augustine lib. 3. contr. Parmen. c. 6. *sacrilega schismata, vel hæreses impiæ, si quando in flagello, vt se corrigant, admonentur, pœnas furoris sui, etiam inter martyria deputare.* Here Parsons turneth schismata into schismatikes, and hereses into heretikes. He leaueth out also the words, *in flagello vt se corrigant*, and addeth true, to Martyrdome.

To these words of our Sauiour Matth 25 *separabit eos ab inuicem sicut pastor separat oues ab hœdis*, he addeth these words at the last iudgement, and forsaking the authenticall Latine translatoin, hee turneth hœdos into goates. And both these sentences he applieth against true Christian Martyrs, that are neither heretikes nor goates.

In his epistle dedicatory he saith his former booke of three conuersions containeth the beginning, progresse and continuance of that faith, and religion, which Papists professe this day

day, and for which they haue suffered many yeares. But in his sayings two grosse lies are conteined, for neither is the moderne Roman religion concerning the carnall eating of Christs body and swallowing it downe into the belly, nor the Popish worship of saints and Angels, nor the rest of the Romish trash and traditions, which we refuse in England, recorded in any auncient histories, nor did the fauourers of the Pope suffer death for meere matter of religion, but for attempting or practising against the Prince and state.

Where also he telleth vs, that the Roman Church is spred ouer the world. Which is a grosse, and most absurd fiction. For were Rome brought into stones and all the Iebusites shinnes cut into thongs; yet would there not be found so many stones, as to cast into euery corner of the world one, nor would these thongs compasse the third part of the world. So farre is the Church of Rome from compassing all the world.

Alledging the Apostles words 1. Cor. 10. he saith, that our Sauiour imparteth with vs his blessed body in the sacrament of the altar, which Saint Paul calleth participation and communion of his sacred body. But he falsifieth the words of the Apostle. For he calleth not Christs body really eaten, but the bread which we breake, a participation of his body. *Panis quem frangimus*, saith he, *nonne participatio corporis domini est?* He doth also tell a lye of our Sauior, albeit he be Truth. For he imparteth not his body by carnall eating, but by a spirituall coniunction made betwixt Christ and vs, through the operation of the spirit, and true faith.

Where he telleth vs, that good deuout S. Augustin teacheth vs, lib. 20. de ciuit. dei. c. 9. and ser. 181. de tempore, that we haue communion with soules departed, whether they be in ioy and felicity, and so pray for vs; or in paines and purgation, and are so praid for by vs, this prophane and false Friar abuseth that holy father. For neither doth he speake of prayers of saints for vs, nor of Purgatory, but rather condemneth both, as before I haue proued out of the words of Saint Augustine.

He addeth how Sir Iohn Oldcastle, Sir Roger Acton, and aboue forty more were hanged in S. Giles his field for treason, and actuall rebellion, and for conspiring of the death of King Henry the fift and his brethren. but he varieth in number from our Chronicles, and in the report of the story from truth, as before is declared. It appeareth also in this, to be a malicious calumniation, for that the aduersaries confesse, that Sir Iohn Oldcastle was in Wales, when this act is pretended to haue bene committed. But if he had said, how Percy, Catesby, Digby and other Papists set on by the Pope and his complices conspired to destroy the King and his linage and al the Lords and commons of the Parliament, and to make a generall insurrection in England, he had said somewhat.

Of Iohn Claydon he giueth out, that being by occupation a curriar of leather, he made himselfe a Bishop, and ordeined his sonne Priest, and caused him to say Masse. But these be so grosse lies, that if Sir Robert were brought before an equall iudge, he might percase haue his leather curred for lying. In themeane while we vrge him to bring forth his authors.

Talking of William Flower, that wounded a Priest saying Masse, he affirmeth, that he said, he did it by inspiration and secret direction from God. But the mans answeres declare the contrary. Parsons therefore by inspiration of the diuell telleth these lies.

In disgrace of religion he telleth vs, that the Waldensians, Albigensians, Wicleffistes, Lollardes, Hussites, Thaborites, and Lutherans, abhorre and condemne expressely the religion professed in England, and that each one died for his peculiar opinions. But if this Italeuated Masse-priest were put to make proofe of his sayings, vpon paine of hanging, he would wish himselfe as far as mount Thabor from the trial. For neither did the Christians thus nickenamed die for peculiar opinions, but for the defence of Catholike faith, against Papists, nor did they either expressely, or by implication condemne that faith, which we professe, and themselues in most points hold.

He

He telleth also, how Colins being mad, and Cowbridge denying Christ, and Peter German denying Christs incarnation, and Iohn Vessalian denying the proceeding of the holy Ghost from the father and the sonne, and Antony Person, that expounded these words, take and eate, this is my body broken for you, of the breaking and dividing of the word of God, are all made Martyrs. But whosoeuer list to see the records of these matters, shall find, that howsoeuer they are made Martyrs, he hath made many grosse lies in these few words. For of Colins M. Fox saith expressly, that he doth not recite him in the number of Martyrs. Of Cowbridge he affirmeth, that he was madde. That he denied Christ, is a calumniation, vnlesse he were madde. Peter German is not once mentioned by him. Nor will it be proued, that Vessalian denied the proceeding of the holy Ghost from the sonne. That also which is reported of Antony Persons, is a meere coggary. If the calendar-maker were mistaken in Colins and Cowbridge, what is that to Master Fox?

In his double Calendar he writeth of S. Agnes, that she suffered vnder Dioeletian. But Baronius refuteth this lie. For he saith there is nothing expressed of the time of her passion. He saith also, that a Church is made of the bawdy house, where this saint was brought forth to be prostituted. Which sheweth that the Church of Rome is the Mother of fornications, worshipping idols, and making Churches of bawdy houses.

Upon the 22. of Ianuary he alledgeth foure sermons of saint Augustine made vpon Saint Vincentius, and mentioned by Possidonius, as he saith, in indiculo. But neither those sermons are to be found, nor is that inder of any credit, being lately set out by fallaries.

Upon the fift of February he telleth vs, that the memorie of Saint Agatha was kept with great solemnity among ancient Christians, as appeareth by Saint Gregory lib. 3. epist. 19. But Gregory neither mentioneth ancient Christians, nor any solemnity vsed in her honour. He saith only, that a certeine memory of her was a denne of hereticall prauity.

Upon

Upon the 7. of February is placed Richard King of England, neuew of offa, and father of Willibald, Winibald, and Waldeburga, as Parsons saith. But our English stories haue no such King, nor our English Calender any such Saint. Capgraue maketh mention of Walburga, Willebrordus, after called Boniface, and Willebaldus. But he giueth no signification, as if they had a King to their father.

February 10. speaking of Soteris, he saith that she suffred vnder Diocletian the Emperour in the way called Appia, and for proofe referreth vs to Saint Ambrose lib. 2. de virgin. But neither is that booke authenticall, nor doth that author mention Diocletian, nor is the way Appia in Rome, but out of Rome.

February 12. he telleth how Eulalia was crucified at Barcinona in Spaine. But Prudentius Peristeph. hym. 2. doth discouer his leasing. For he saith she was burned at Emerita in Portogall, then called Lusitania.

Upon the tenth of March he saith, that Constantine and Helena by the counsell and exhortation of Macarius, did purge certaine places from idolatry, and build Churches to Christ and his saints. But this is a foule lie, and cannot bee purged with a pound of Rubarbe. For Eusebius lib. 3. de vit. Constant. saith, he built a monument or Church to our Sauiour. And in the same booke c. 42. speaking of Helena, *deo quem adorauerunt*, saith he, *duo dicauit templa*. That is, she built two churches to God, whom they worshipped. And so say all authenticall writers, that mention these buildings. S. Augustine speaking of Martyrs saith expressely, *eis templa non construimus*: we build no churches vnto them. And certes, if they destroied idols, they could not build Churches to saints.

Speaking of Iulius the 12. of April he saith, he was a great Pope, and recalled from banishment S. Athanasius and other Bishops, and for proofe he referreth vs to the second apology of Athanasius. But neither doth Athanasius say any such matter, nor could Iulius restore others, being banished himselfe, as Vsuardus testifieth, nor was he like the moderne Popes, that weare triple crownes, and take vpon them to depose Princes.

Princes. of this great man therefore, this great cogger telleth great lies.

Upon the 2. of June he ſaith, that Conſtantine the Great built a Church to Marcellinus and Petrus, and for euidence citeth Gregory, homil. 6. and lib. 4. regeſt. c. 88. But in neither place is any mention made of Conſtantine or his building. Only in the title of that homily there is mention made of the Baſilic, or great monument of Peter and Marcellinus, and lib. 4. epiſt. c. 88. of Albinus, that was curat of the Church, where Marcellinus and Petrus were ſaid to be enterred.

The 4. of June Quirinus is remembred, who as Parſons ſaith, being caſt into a riuer with a milſtone about his necke, ſwimmed vp and downe exhorting Chriſtians to conſtancy, and praid that he might not be depriued of Martyrdome, and ſo was drowned. And for this he bringeth two witneſſes, Prudentius in hym. ſacro, and Venant. Fortunatus. But the lie is ſo great, that if he were caſt into a poole with a Millſtone about his necke, he would well deſerue it. For neither doe Martyrs praie to be drowned, nor doe his witneſſe teſtifie any ſuch matter.

Speaking of heretikes dying for their particular opinion, he telleth how Ioan Bourcher ſhould ſaie, that ſhee died for a peece of fleſh, as Anne Aſkew died for a peece of bread, and Docter Story preached at the ſtake. Two groſſe lies, ſhewing, that he lieth for a cruſt of bread. Of the firſt he hath beene admoniſhed heretofore. The ſecond is eaſily refuted, for that Story was neither Prieſt, nor Preacher at a ſtake. true it is, that he frequented brothell houſes, and Aleſtakes, and purſued many to the fire ſtake.

Pag. 2. he citeth theſe words out of Tit. 3. *quia ſubuerſus eſt, & proprio iudicio condemnatus.* But the Latine tranſlation, which Papiſts hold to be authenticall, hath them otherwiſe: *Subuerſus eſt, quiesmodi eſt, & delinquit, cum ſit proprio iudicio condemnatus.* He doth alſo falſely tranſlate the word ἀυτοκατάκριτος. For it ſignifieth not condemned by his owne iudgement, but by his owne act. For no man is condemned

ned in his owne iudgement; nor may we thinke, that the word Iudgement is repeated twise in so short a sentence, which should be done if an Heretike be condemned by his owne iudgement.

Pag. 4. he maketh Christ to say, Apocal. 2. 3. 13. that he hath placed saints as victors in heauenly thrones of glory, to be pillars vnto vs in this life. Certes grossely falsified. For Apocalyp. 3. he saith only, him that ouercommeth I will make a pillar in the temple of my God. And he speaketh as well of this life, as of the life to come. Afterward he saith, to him that ouercommeth, will I grant to sit with me in my throne. So it appeareth, he speaketh of Christs throne, and not of the throne of saints.

Pag. 5. he saith, benefites are asked of saints, not as authors and giuers thereof. A lie refuted by infinit examples of the Missals, breuiaries and primers. To the Virgin Mary they say directly, *solue vincla reis, profer lumen cæcis &c.*

Pag. 6. and 7. so praied Salomon, saith he, Psal. 131. naming still the merites of his father, as intercessor for him. And againe so praied Dauid himself naming Abraham, Isaac, and Iacob for his intercessors, Paralip. 29. he citeth also 2. Paralip. 5. 3. Reg 18. Deut. 9. and Exod. 32. And saith, that Iacob praied to Angels, Genc. 41. but here is as it were a cluster of lies, and false allegations put downe together. For first Psal. 131. Salomon is not named, and the same seemeth rather to be the praier of the Church, then of one man. Secondly the scripture there neither mentioneth merits, nor the intercession of Dauid. Thirdly, Dauid, 1. Paralip. 29. praieth to God, and not to saints, and not once mentioneth intercession of saints. Fourthly, in the 2. Paralip. 5. there is nothing of merits or intercession of Saints. Fifthly, Ezech. 3. Reg. 18. praied to God directly. The like may be said of the rest of the places mentioned. Finally, he mistaketh Genes. 41. for 48. where by the Angell, our Sauiour Christ is meant.

Pag. 7. he falsifieth egregiously a place of Iosephus, lib. 3. de bel. Iudaic. c. 14. to proue inuocation of Saints. Parsons maketh him to say, *puræ animæ, quæ exaudiunt inuocantes.*

Where

Where Iosephus hath, *pura & qua innocantes exaudiantur anima retinent locum in cælo adepta sanctissimum, & inde rursus volentibus seculis casta corpora inhabitare incolere.* The Greeke hath ἀκήκοοι μόνον. So it appeareth, that he saith, that pure soules are heard of God, and not that they heare the praiers of others. And further, that he beleeued the translation of soules from one body to another, according to the error of Pythagoras. But this latter part is cut off by Parsons, and the former falsified. Besides that, suppose Saints should heare mens praiers, yet it is one thing for saints to heare, and another to see, as it were in speculo, which the Papists imagine, they doe.

Pag. 9. For proofe of praiers to saints he alledgeth diuers counterfet writings set out vnder the names of Fathers. his first witnesse is Origen in lamento. But this is condemned by Gelasius dist. 15. c. sancta. as apocryphall. He that published his workes calleth this treatise, a faction of some vnlearned fellow. Further, he speaketh as wel to the diuell, as to saints, saying, *o diabole quid feci sti mihi.* Parsons citeth also Origens commentaires vpon Iob, which are euidently knowen to be written by a Latine author, and an Arian or Sabellian. For blasphemously he calleth the holy Trinity *tria cornua diaboli*, and condemneth those that beleeue the Trinity, for sectaries. His other witnesses are Nazianzen, Ephrem, Nectarius, Nyssen, Chrysostome, Cyril, and the councell of Chalcedon. But Nazianzen and Gregory Nyssen doe speake like orators to men absent, and pray not to Martyrs, in their publike and priuate praiers. Ephrems sermons de sanctis are counterfet, so are likewise diuers homilies of Chrysostom, and his liturgie. Nectarius neuer made an oration vpon Theodoret the Martyr. In the councell of Chalcedon neither Cyril, nor that councell affirmed with one voice that Flauianus prayd for them. It was the voice onely of certaine clerkes of Constantinople, who said only, *Flauianus post mortem vivit, Adartyr pro nobis oret*; which betokeneth rather their desire, then what he performed.

Pag. 19. he saith, that the forme of publike praiers, processions,

sions, and invocation of saints, named the litanies, was vsed generally in the Latine Church, and mentioned in many synods and councels aboue a thousand yeares agone. But that is a grosse fiction, and plainly refuted by the councels of Orleans, Gerand, Toleto, and Bracara cited by him. For therein is not any mention made of prayers to saints set downe, nor any forme expressed.

Pag. 17. he affirmeth, that Luther allowed prayers to saints, and alledgeth a letter, wherin they make him raile vpon the Bohemians. But the letter is by his aduersaries corrupted, if euer he wrot any such letter. Parsons his assertion is refuted by Luthers Commentaries vpon the first of Ioel.

Pag. 19. he citeth these words *solo deo creatore adorato inuocet Christianus sanctos &c.* Out of a canon of the sixth synod. But this sheweth him, and his consorts to be plaine falsaries. For they are not to be found either in the originall Greeke, or old Latine copies. Bellar. lib. de sanct. beat. c. 19. sheweth they are found only in late editions: viz in falsified copies.

Pag. 21. he affirmeth, that the Catholike doctrine of inuocation of saints was by Bernard confirmed by a miracle: and for that he alledgeth lib. 3. de vit. Bernard. c. 5. but neither doth that legend deserue any credit, nor doth the author thereof helpe this lying companion, nor will this false heretical Friar euer proue this doctrine to be Catholike.

Pag. 29. he belieth M. Fox, saying, that he placeth his triumphant Church, (he meaneth Martyrs and Confessors) in Heauen. But it neuer entred into his thought, to take vpon him to canonize either man or woman. This is the pride of the Pope, which he disliked, and which all good men detest.

Pag. 32. he saith, that all ecclesiasticall bookes and monuments were burned and defaced by Diocletian, and for it citeth Eusebius lib. 8. c. 2. & 3. But of ecclesiasticall monuments he lieth. Eusebius his words he falsifieth. For he speaketh only of burning holy scriptures. And I hope Rob. Parsons, albeit he seeth not well without spectacles, will put some

some difference betwixt Legends or Martyrologies, and holy canonicall scriptures.

Pag. 34. he alledgeth Cyprians life written by Pontius his Deacon. But that is a false instrument. For therein mention is made of King Charles that liued many yeares after Cyprian and Pontius.

Pag. 35. of Paulinus he saith, that he wrot, how he was vnder the care of Castus Diaconus, to write and record all things exactly of the Church of Milan, to be examined by the said Castus. And for this he alledgeth the life of S. Ambrose written by Paulinus. But first this Paulinus is a counterfet. Next he hath not one word either of the recording of the actes of the Church of Milan, or of the examining of matters by Castus. His words are only these, *Castus diaconus, sub cuius cura degebam.* was not this Friar then an impure fellow, thus to bely Castus?

To proue the corruption of the histories of Martyrs pag. 36. and 37. he alledgeth Epiphanius hæres. 30. 27. and 47. Augustine lib. de fid. contr. Manichæos, Orosius epist. ad Augustinum de error. Priscill. Philaster and Cyril, I know not where. But after his old fashion he lieth and mistaketh. Epiphanius in the places cited speaketh of heretikes, that corrupted holy scriptures, and alledged counterfet & apocryphall stuffe vnder the name of the Apostles, as Parsons and his mates, alledge false epistles, sermons, and treatises vnder the names of fathers. S. Augustine in the place mentioned hath not one word to purpose. Orosius neuer wrot such an epistle, as is pretended. Neither doe we yet find any word in Philaster, and Cyril concerning the corruption of Martyrologies, and Legends. But should we grant them to be heretikes and false packers, that doe corrupt the histories of Martyrs; yet would they fall vpon the poshorne pates of the Masse-priests, who with lies and fables haue most shamefully corrupted the Legends of saints, as may easily appeare by infinit particulars.

Pag. 39. he telleth, how the Marcionites opposed their Martyrs to the Church Martyrs, and preferred them, in that they

they were more resolute. and this, as he pretendeth, is proued out of Eusebius lib. 5. c. 15. and Tertullian in his booke, de fuga in persec. But neither doe we reade, that the Marcionites did so, nor doth either Eusebius affirme it, or Tertullian compare Martyrs to Martyrs.

Pag. 46. and 47. he telleth vs of the Martyrdome of king Edmond at Hegglesdowne, and of S. Ebba and her nunnes, that to keepe thēselues chaste, cut off their vpper lippes. And for proofe alledgeth Matth. Westm. flores hist. an. 870. But his tales be fraught with lies. For first it cannot easily be proued, that King Edmond died for Christian religion, considering that he went with his army to defend his country against the Danes, and died in that action. Secondly, it is said, that his head being cut from his body, vttered these words, here, here. And that being added to his body, it claue fast vnto it; and Lastly, that his body remained vncorrupt diuers yeers. Which be three grosse Ponkish lies. Thirdly, Capgraue in the life of S. Ebba signifieth, that she died not of force, but a naturall death, and that her Nunnes liued dishonestly, and were therefore burnt with fire from heauen. Which is quit contrarie to Parsons his tale of their Martyrdome. Finally, in Flor. hist. an. 870. there is not so much as any mention made of Ebba, or of this fact of her Nunnes. So properly doth Parsons his witnesses speake to his purpose.

Speaking of Thomas Becket pag. 47. he saith, that of his glorious Martyrdome and infinit miracles ensuing thereon all Historiographers haue giuen most honorable testimony vnto this day. Yet Cæsarius Heisterbach lib. 8. c. 69. saith, it was disputed by some in Paris that he was damned. *Quidam dixerunt eum damnatum*, saith he. Other Historiographers say little of his Martyrdome, and tell of his miracles. His death was for maintenance of felons and murderers, that they might not be iusticed by the Kings lawes. The same Heisterbach sheweth that many false reliques are worshipped for true; as for example, a bridle worshipped for a relique of Beckets, although it was none of his.

For

For declaration of the causes moving Papists to worship saints Pag. 60. and 61. he alledgeth two sermons de sanctis in number the 44. and 47. ascribed to Saint Augustine, and Pag. 62. a sermon of S. Ambrose de Sanctis Nazario & Celso. But first this sermon of Saint Ambroses is not to be found in old editions. Secondly the pretended sermons of S. August. are plainly counterfet. Serm. 44. speaking of cruelty endured, that author doth Latin it thus, *indurata sanuia*. Again he hath these words, *ecclesia in pressuris posita infirmiora sua membra confortat, dicens, in mundo pressuram habebitis*. But S. Augustine was not so ignorant, as to ascribe Christs words to the church, or to suppose the Apostles to be weaker members of the Church.

Pag. 66. he saith that Thomas Becket, Fisher, More, Campian, and Sherwin agreed both within themselues, and with the Catholike Church of their times, and of former times in all points of Christian faith. But this grosse lie is refuted by the histories of all times, that shew how the worship of saints, the doctrine of the reall presence of Christs body in the sacrament, of transubstantion, of the communion vnder one kind, of Purgatory, of the Popes supremacy and other points of papish heresies came in by little and little. Now it shall be sufficient to know, that neither any ancient Christian, nor Fisher, and More, knew the doctrine of the counsell of Trent.

Pag. 67. he rehearseth these words, *nos pene omnia Martyrum &c.* About of an epistle of Gregory lib. 7. epist. 29. ad Eulogium, where as they plainly contradict other words of that author, for before he had said, he had no memoriall of these matters. There also he saith, that Saint Augustine doth every where shew this to haue begne the vse of the Church in his time, to wit, to say Masse and offer sacrifice to God in the memory and commemoration of Martyrs, as namely lib. 20. cont. Faust. Manich. c. 22. & lib. 8. de ciuit. dei c. 27. & lib. 22. c. 10. & quæst. 41. in Genes. & lib. 20. con. Faust. c. 21. Which is a most grosse and shamelesse assertion compounded of diuers vntruthes. For first, there is not any mention made of the Masse in any of these places. Secondly, he doth not

speake so absurdly, as to say, that sacrifice was offered to God in memory or commemoration of Martyrs. Parsons should say, that the names of Martyrs were mentioned at the time of the celebration of the eucharist. And this was all the honor done to Martyrs in old time. Finally, where S. Augustine lib. 20. contr. Faust. Manich. c. 21. hath, *in memoriis Martyrum*, that is, in the monuments or at the burials of Martyrs; Parsons hath corrupted the words, and written, *in memoriis Martyrum*: as if the eucharist had beene celebrated, not for a remembrance of Christs death according to his institution, but for a memoriall of the death of Martyrs.

Pag. 70. he affirmeth, that Hierome lib. 2. in epist. ad Gal. c. 4. saith, that Christians in his daies did vse to meete and offer sacrifice on the annuall daies of Martyrs. But notoriously he abuseth Hierome. For he hath not one word of offering sacrifice. He saith only, *diuersa in honore Martyrum tempora constituta*. That is, divers times were appointed for the honor of Martyrs. But all the honor, that was done them, was the rehearsall of their names during the time of the celebration of the eucharist.

Pag. 71. rehearsing these words out of Saint Augustine lib. 22. de ciuit. Dei. c. 10. *Suo loco & ordine recitabantur*. He cutteth off both the beginning & end of the sentence, wherin that holy doctor ouerthroweth the popish worship of saints. For he denieth, that either churches were built in honor of Martyrs, or that they were called vpon, or prayed vnto by the Priest.

Pag. 47. he telleth his reader, that images erected, and lights burnt, and other honors given to saints by Papists, were dayly exhibited to Martyrs in old time. But he lieth not only dayly, but also most shamefully. For never shall he proue, that ancient Christians set vp images to Martyrs and fell downe before them, or that they prayed to them, and said speciall Masses in their honor, and worshipped them after the Romish guise.

Pag. 90. rehearsing the words of Vrspergensis concerning the Waldensians he addeth these words, speaking of the women, to be lawfull and holy. All the titles of Waldensians, Albigensians,

Albigenſians, Wickleffians, Lutherans, and ſuch like, are ſlanderous. The report likewiſe of their differences, and of certaine leud and wicked errors ſuppoſed to be holden by them, is nothing but a packe of lies deuiſed by their malicious enemies, and obiected by ſuch paraſites, as the Pope hireth to ſpeake ſhame of honeſt men. Firſt he ſaith, that from the time of Siluester downeward both the Waldenſians, and we teach, that no man can bee ſaued holding the faith of the Roman Church. This he affirmeth moſt falſely and wickedly of both. Why doth not the leud lozell therefore bring forth witneſſes, and proues, and conuince them, that haue ſo taught?

Secondly, he affirmeth, that the Waldenſians derided publike prayer, and ſinging in the Church, that they held the Maſſe and freewill in that ſenſe, that Parſons and his gon lots doe. That they allowed all religious orders, except the begging Friars. Matters either deuiſed by Parſons, or by ſome other, as malicious as he. Proues he bringeth none, but the teſtimony of men as light as chaffe.

Thirdly, he imputeth vnto them, that they held all prieſts to be of equall authority and dignity, and denied all miracles, and gaue to all men liberty to preach, and to adminiſter the ſacraments. But in the firſt point Parſons contradicteth himſelfe. For before he related, that they confeſſed, that there were three eccleſiaſtical orders in the Church, viz. Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons. In the other twoo he contradicteth truth, being not able to conuince them of theſe errors.

Fourthly, he telleth, that they permitted promiſcuall copulation of both kinds. A lie deuiſed by Sodomiticall Maſſe-prieſts and Friars, and willingly reported by this baſe Iebuſite, begotten by promiſcuall copulation, without certaine father.

Fifthly, he reporteth, that the Albigians called a king of the Mores out of Afrike to ioyne with them againſt Chriſtians, and that they beleeued two Creators, denied the reſurrection of the body, reiected baptiſme, held paſſing of ſoules

with Pythagoras from one body to another, and diuers such like absurdities. But in the obiections the Papists agree not among themselues. Neither doe they bring either the parties confession, or other good proofe. As well therefore may a man beleeue Turkes speaking against Christians, as these fellowes, railing against their enemies.

Sixthly, he forgeth diuers false assertions, and laieth them to the charge of them, which he calleth Wickleffians, as namely, that it is not lawfull for ecclesiasticall persons to hold temporall possessions: that there is no ciuill Lord, Prince, Prelat or Bishop, (viz. that is so to be taken) while he is in mortall sinne. That a Priest in mortall sinne doth not consecrate or baptise: that Vniuersities and Colledges are things of Paganisme. Of which, if he bring not good proofe, it will be an easie matter to proue, that he lieth maliciously like a Turke or Pagan. That these are matters deuised, it may appeare, for that betwixt these articles, and the articles condemned in Wickleffes time, and in the conuenticle of Constance, there is no small difference.

Seuenthly, he blusheth not to tell, that the Lollardes beleeued, that Lucifer and his damned Angels were iniuriously put out of Heauen, and that Michael & his Angels are to be damned at the last day of Iudgement, and other absurd and blasphemous opinions. But when he lieth thus desperatly, he should doe well to put on the maske of some montebanke. So farre is his affirmation from all shew of truth, that he is neither able to name any one man, that held these opinions, nor by good euidence to shew, that any at all did so beleeue, as is said.

Finally, he obiecteth diuers horrible things against Luther, Zuinglius, and Caluin, saying that Luther denied all freewill, and held, that the adultery of Dauid and treason of Iudas was as well wrought by God as the vocation of Paul, that a maried man, his wife refusing, may call his maid: that to fight against Turkes is to resist the will of God: that Zuinglius held Sacraments to be only externall signes: and that a man by force of naturall vertues only might gaine life euerlasting:

sting, that Caluin taught, that God is the author of all sinne, and that the Diuell is a liar by Gods commandement, and other such like wicked and blasphemous assertions. He obiecteth also the same impieties to Germans & English and others. But if his conscience tell him not, that he lieth, or at the least telleth lies received of others; yet both the confessions and writings of Luther, Zuinglius and Caluin, and of Dutch & English mayntayne him therof. All we say Anathema both to these opinions, and to the heresies of Parsons.

Pag. 156. he saith, that Gregory lib. 31. moral. c. 31. teacheth, that as constancy and perseuerance in good, is a worthy vertue, so obstinacy and pertinacy is a wicked vice, and proceeding of a naughty spirit, and daughter properly to vaine glory, and borne together with sixe other sisters &c. But it may be he hath warrant to lie vpon the head of Gregory. Howsoeuer he can warrant his saying; in the place mentioned it is certaine that no such matter is to be found.

Finally, Pag. 158. 160. and 167. he falsifieth diuers sentences out of S. Augustine, sometime adding, sometime taking from his words, and no where dealing with him, or with his reader sincerely. If then Parsons alledging so few testimonies of fathers, and other authors in this booke, haue either belied them, or corrupted their testimonies, he hath but litle reason to make vs more relations concerning certaine few supposed false allegations out of many, vntill he haue cleared himselfe. A more absurd forger he could not be, vnlesse he were a master forgerer of the father and forger of lies.

CHAP. IX.

A note of certaine eminent fooleries and ignorances appearing in the third part of his treatise of three conuersions of England.

I doubt not but the Masse-priests doe esteeme their father Parsons both wise and learned. And it is apparent by the

some of his writing, that he hath a farre higher conceit of his owne wisedome and learning, then his owne disciples. Yet if he be pleased to put on his Crystall spectacles, and to look nerely to these notes, and conferre them with his own words; it may be he will abate some what of his proud conceit; his scholars also perusing the same shall discerne him the better to be a noddy, under the cõtinued mask of N.D.

First dedicating his whole discourse concerning the Martyrs & Confessors mentioned by M. Fox, to those of the religion professed in England, whereby it is apparent, that he maketh them either patrons or Iudges of his braue worke, he like a wise pleader doth raile vpon them to their face, as heretikes, sectaries, companions with theeues and adulterers, and notorious wicked persons. Now, I pray you, what may a man thinke of him, that pleading before a Iudge doth raile on him to his teeth, or seeking patronage and defence of his labor, doth vse spitefull termes against his patrons, and defenders? Furthermore was not this idolatrous worshipper of saints and idols, out of his wits, trow you, that to true Christians directeth the defence of his wicked superstitions and idolatries?

In his double calendar vpon the second of Ianuary, speaking of Macarius, he maketh him an abbat. Yet Popish abbats were birds not seene in the world in those dates. Baronius in his annotations vpon the Martyrologe maketh him only either a Priest of Alexandria, or an Ægyptiã, & no more. To proue the admirable life of this Macarius, he alledgeth a booke made either by Euagrius alone, or by him and Palladius, intitled Vita Patrum. And yet did he neuer see in his life a booke of this title, made by that author. Baronius in 17. Ianuarij mentioneth one Euagrius Ponticus. But he doth shew, that he was an Origenian heretike. Further he doth not mention any booke written by him of this title.

Vpon the third of Ianuary he maketh Auterus Pope, and yet neuer could procure himselfe to be made Cardinall. He maketh him also a Martyr, yet was it neuer heard, that a triple crowned Pope was a Martyr. Lastly he saith, he was

Martyred

Martyred for gathering Martyrs acts & gests, and for proofe citeth Augustines epist. 165. and Eusebius lib. 6. c. 22. and Optatus lib. 2. contr. Parmen. But what is more ridiculous, then for a man to make a shew of witnesses, that depose nothing to his purpose? May Optatus calleth Syricius Bishop of Rome his companion, Socius noster. So it appeareth, that the Bishops of Rome then were not so gallant, as our moderne Popes.

Upon the 9. of Ian. he citeth Venantius Fortunatus to proue the Martyrdome of Iulian and Basilissa; and yet as Baronius saith, Basilissa was no Martyr. *licet Martyrium non obierit*, saith he. May out of authenticall writers he can bring no proofe for the Martyrdome of either.

Upon the 18. of Ianuary he placeth S. Peters chaire for a solemne saint painted in red letters. And for proofe he alledgeth Optatus lib. 2. cont. Parmen. But first Optatus speaketh of no wodē chaire, but of S. Peters doctrin. Secondly, this sheweth Parsons and his fellowes to be wodden fellowes, that in their calendars worship wooden chaires and either call vpon things without life, or else place things in the calendar of saints, that are no saints, nor to be worshipped as saints.

Handling the feast of Apollonia Febr. 9. he citeth Euseb. l. 6. c. 44. where that book in Christophorsons editiō hath only 38. Chapters. He saith also, that her teth were beaten out. But Eusebius testifieth that she was very old, *admodum provecta aetate*, whereby we coniecture, she had not many teth in her head, to be beaten out.

For proofe, that Seuerianus was put to death by Eutychian heretikes, vpon the 21. of February, he alledgeth Nicephorus lib. 15. c. 9. and Euagrius lib. 2. c. 5. whereas Euagrius hath not one word, either of the man, or that matter, in that place. This N. D therefore followed the false quotation of Cæsar Baronius, as it should seeme. Nicephorus testifieth, that he was slaine by Theodosius a Monke: which sheweth that Monkes are bloody wolues and heretikes. Hath not then this dizard hurt himselfe with his owne wooden dagger?

Upon the 22. of February Parsons worshippeth Saint Peters chaire at Antioch. And for proofe he alledgeth Eusebius his chronicle. For which service he deserueth to be made groome of the Popes close stole. But if he sat 25. yeares at Antioch, how could saint Peter sit so long at Rome? and if we beleeue Eusebius his chronicle for sitting 25. yeares at Rome, why should we not beleeue him also, that saith he sate 25. yeares at Antioch? further, if his chaire be at Antioch, then can it not well be at Rome, vnlesse he will say he can be in two places, and sit in two chaires at once. Let this wodden worshipper of Chaires therefore beware, that while he placeth Saint Peter in two chaires, he doe not set him betweene two chaires, and put his holy fathers out of Saint Peters chaire, which, as he saith, is at Antioch.

Upon the first of March he alledged Matth. of Westminster an. 871. for proofe of S. Dauids rare vertues and miracles. And yet doth not this witnesse speake one word either of his vertues or of his miracles, or of the man. What rare folly then was this, thus to mistake, and to misalledge his authors?

Speaking of Cedda the second of March, he saith he was Bishop both of the Mercians and of Lindisferne, and for this citeth Bede lib. 1. hist Angl. c. 28. and lib. 4. c. 3. but first it is not probable, that one man should be Bishop of two places so farre distant a sunder at one time. Next, Bede in the first place doth not once mētion Cedda. In the second he conuinceth our aduersarie of great ignorance, that mistoke Lindisferne among the Northumbers, for Lichfield among the Mercians, and made him Bishop of two places, that as Bede witnesseth, was only Bishop of Lichfeld, which was a towne of the Mercians.

March the fourth he maketh Lucius a Martyr and a Pope, so liberall he is in bestowing triple crownes and crownes of Martyrdome. But most simply he alledgeth Cyprian epist. 58. and others for witnesses, that neither testifie his Popedome nor Martyrdome. Optatus lib. 2. contr. Parmen. and S. Augustine epist 165. doe only mention him. Eusebius lib.

lib. 7. c. 2. saith, he died of his naturall death. his wordes are, *morte extinctus.*

March the 7. he saith, that Tertullian lib. de anima, and S. Augustine in Psal. 48. doe speake abundantly of the praises of Perpetua and Felicitas. But if he find not out these abundant praises in that place, the abundance of his folly will appeare easily in this, and diuers other places alledging authors at all aduentures.

Upon the 9. of March speaking of 40. Martyrs, he saith, that Saint Basil and Gregory Nazianzen in two seuerall sermons doe write their praises: whereas only Basil, and not Nazianzen wrot an oration pronounced in the solemnization of the birth day of those Martyrs. Thus still he mistaketh whole bookes and orations.

March the 13. and 14. he citeth the testimony of Lipomanus and Surius, Metaphrastes and Petrus de Natalibus, as of graue authors. Yet who so readeth them, shall soone see, that they are more full of lies, then leaues, and idle writers of Legends, and witnesses of no credit. In other places he alledgeth Bolsec, Staphylus Genebrard, Prateolus, Walsingham, and such like fellowes, whereof two whole dozens are not worth one emptie egge shell, being the parties in the cause, and speaking all the shame, that could be diuised of their enemies without care, reason, or conscience.

Alphred, as all men know, that are not ignorant of English Stories, is a mans name. But Parsons saith, Saint Edward was slaine by Queene Alphred. He might as well haue told a tale of King Ione. He saith also, that this Queene was his stepmother. But Osberne and other writers testifie, that Edger the father of this Edward was but once maried, and that to Queene Elfthride, and that Edward and Edith were bastards and begotten of Elphlede a nunne, and canonized by the Pope as great friendes to his holy kitchin. What then may we thinke of Parsons, that giueth a double feast to King Edward a bastard, but, that bastardes fauour bastardes?

Upon the 31. of May he alledgeth S. Augustine lib. c. Adimantum

mantum c. 17. to proue, that Petronel, S. Peters daughter being beloued and desired by Flaccus an Earle of Rome, tooke three daies to fast and pray, and to deliberate thereof, in which time hauing receiued the sacrament she gaue vp her pure spirit to Christ. Where that father only theweth, how the Manichies out of Apocryphall bookes tell, that S. Peters daughter was stroke with a palsy by her fathers prayers. so it appeareth that foolishly he bowcheth authors, that speake nothing to purpose: nay authors, that testifie, how the Legends of Popish saints are derived out of Apocryphall writings forged by heretikes. Further, he sheweth himselfe simple to thinke, that the Romans in those times had Earles, or those which were called Comites, absolutely.

Vpon the 8. of June speaking of Medard, and Gildard, he saith, the one was Bishop of Swessons. And for that alledgeth Sigobertus an. 535. but his witnesse hath Nouiomensem and not Swessionensem, as this blind fellow writeth.

For testimony of the rites and Martyrdome of Gallicanus mentioned the 25 of June, he alledgeth Euseb. lib. 4. vit. Constant. c. 5. 6. & 7. where there is not so much as his name, much lesse any mention of his life, faith, or Martyrdome.

Pag. 10. he telleth vs, how Cyprian the blessed Martyr humbly besought the virgin Mary &c. And alledgeth for euidence Nazianzens oration in Cyprianum. But the pure idiot mistaketh Cyprian for Iustina, of whom the author of that oration vttereth some such like words. Further he misliketh the author of that oration. For whereas he saith, that such a learned father, as Nazianzen, could be deceiued with this apocryphall fable of Cyprians practise of art magicke, being conuinced by Gelasius dist. 15. c. sancta Romana, and renounced by Baronius himselfe an. 250. *Explosa*, saith he, *fabula illa de Cypriani Magica arte?*

Pag. 13. he citeth Nectarius his oration de S. Theodoro Martyre, being not able to shew vs any such oration. And Pag. 48. for Venantius Fortunatus, he nameth Claudianus Fortunatus. What neede we then further proofes of his ignorance, seeing it appeareth, that as yet he can not well name the

the authors, that are cited in his cause?

Pag. 21. for the 66. homily of Bernard in Cant. he citeth the sixth, and telleth vs, as a point of his chronological skill, that the Albigenses did broch their impieties in his daies. Which, as his owne Chronologies might haue taught him, were not heard of vntill 80. yeares after Bernards time. If the silly idiot could haue vnderstood Bernard, he might haue seene, that he speaketh against certaine heretikes called Apostolikes, a packe of sectaries like the begging Friars, condemning mariages, and tying themselues with vowes of constancy, *in experimentum turpitudinis*, that is, to cover their turpitude, as Bernard saith. Which, lest the reader should vnderstand, the falsary curtalleth his words, setting that downe only, that maketh for him.

Pag. 23. ridiculously he maketh the solemnity of an Apostle an intercessor for him, and a meanes to encrease in him deuotion and saluation, saying, *da quæsumus, omnipotens deus vt B. N. Apostoli tui, quam præcinimus venerãda solemnitas & deuotionem nobis augeat & salutem.* that is, giue vnto vs, we beseech thee, almighty God, that the worshipfull solenity of thy blessed Apostle N. which we preuent, may encrease in vs deuotion and saluation. Pag. 28. he maketh God a mediator to saints. For there he prayeth God, that men may feele their patronage, that record their merites. But why should he pray to God for this, vnlesse he make God a Mediatour to Saints?

Pag. 31. he saith, that Calendæ, or Calendarium commeth of a Latine word. But Macrobius saturnal. lib. 1. c. 15. refuteth his ignorance, shewing, that it commeth of the Greeke word καλῶ.

Pag. 33. he saith, Cyprian epist. 27. or lib. 3. epist. 6. talketh of certaine Martyrs, that had suffered in his absence. But his words doe shew, that he speaketh of certaine confessors, that died in prison.

Pag. 34 he telleth vs, how Tertullian in his booke de corona milit. calleth ecclesiasticall tables fastos ecclesiasticos. A grosse error, yet common to him with B. Rhenanus. For

Tertullian

Tertullian doth not so much as meane, much lesse mention ecclesiasticall tables, but only sheweth, that Christians are Calendred in Heauen, and therefore ought to abandon earthly pleasures. *Noster inquit, mancipatus est cœlis, habet tuos census, tuos fastos, nihil ei cum quadra seculi.*

Pag. 38. for Theodorus Balsamon he taketh his penne, and writeth Theodorus Balsamus, and for the 47. canon of the 3. councel of Carthage, writeth the 13.

Pag. 39. you may see, saith he, by the complaint of holy Apollinaris Bishop of Hierapolis, whose wordes Eusebius citeth lib. 5. c. 19. But euery man may see, that is not blind like Parsons, that these are not the wordes of Apollinaris, which he citeth, but of an other not named by Eusebius. *Quidam ex his*, saith he, *in principio operis.*

Pag. 40. he taketh of an epistle of Cyprian to Thebaritus. But the simple idcot mistooke a man for a towne, or parish. For lib. 4. epist. 6. the direction of this epistle is, *plebi Thibari consistenti.* This being the mans ignorance, it is no wonder, if he be well perswaded of transubstantiation, seeing so easily by his omnipotent ignorance he turneth townes into men, men into women, and contrariwise, & English youthes into Italienated traitors and gunpowder men and miners.

Pag. 47. for Hitterbach he citeth Heistebert, an author only knowen to himselfe, and for proofe of Thomas Beckets Martyrdome and Miracles, a leud Legend entitled Quadrilogus, or quadriga, that is, a cartload of lies and foleries.

Pag. 73. he alledgeth Ambroses epistle in number 85. ad sororem, and his 92. and 93. epistle, whereas in old editions there are no more epistles set out vnder the name of Ambrose then 85. and diuers of them vnworthy his wisdom and learning, and yet none to his sister.

Pag. 76. For Maximus Maudarensis mentioned by Saint Augustine, he writeth Maximus Medaurensis.

In the third chapter of his examen he mentioneth diuers Christians, that contradicted and renounced the abuses and impieties of the synagogue of Rome from time to time since they first entred into the same. Now who can deny this to be

a

a singular peece of folery: For if he say, they were heretikes, and held diuers impious opinions, it may be easily answered, that these were fictions of their enemies, and no opinions of theirs, and that they were farre better Catholiks, then their aduersaries. But the other point is confessed by Parsons himselfe.

Pag. 154. and 155. taking vpon him to speake diuinity, like a doctor of the chaire, he deriueth his grounds from Thomas Aquinas, Aristotle and Hippocrates. This sheweth, that his doctrine is very naturall, if not grosse, and fecall.

Behold therefore you disciples of Antichrist the grosse ignorance and folery of this thrise conuerted Proteus in very few leaues of a moity of the third part of three conuersions. What a masse of errors then will appeare, if all his absurdities and foleries were brought together, out of the whole worke?

CHAP. X.

A breefe collection of Parsons *his testimonies, allegations, and arguments, making against himselfe, his consorts, and their cause.*

MUch, as you see, hath beene said against Parsons. But, as some suppose, lesse would haue serued. For had we said nothing, his owne testimonies, allegations and arguments would haue serued sufficiently, to haue ouerthrowen the man, and his cause. So wisely hath he caried himselfe.

In the front of his booke he alledgeth out of Augustine lib. 3. contr. Parmen. c. 6. that sacrilegious schismatikes, and impious heretikes dare presume, when they are punished, to account the punishment of their fury for true Martyrdome. Which sentence deserueth to be set on the front of many sacrilegious, schismaticall and impious Papists. For albeit publike records and their owne wicked actions doe testifie, that they haue beene condemned for their furious attempts against Princes and States; yet of their gunpowder consorts

sorts they are Calendred for saints, or Martyrs, as appeareth by the example of the monks, friars, and Masse-priests, that rebelled against King Henry the eight, of the Northren and Irish rebels, that died as traitors, in the late Queenes daies, as Sanders, that died in open rebellion, of Campian, Sherwin and the Popes agents, that were executed for treason. Of Catesby, and Thomas Percy, and others that stood armed against King Iames, and sought to subuert the state. Of Iames Clement, that killed King Henry the third of France, of Chastell, Ghineard the Iebusite, and others, that attempted against the life of Henry the fourth, and diuers others.

In his epistle dedicatory he discourseth at large, What singular hurt, dishonour, and danger doth come by communion and participation with naughty people. And telleth vs how it was obiected by Isay the Prophet to some men, that they were *socij furum*, companions with theeues: and to others by another Prophet, that they did put their portion with adulterers and wicked men. But all the sway of his furious talke falleth vpon Parsons and his wicked consorts. For himselfe was companion with Campian and Parry, and other publike traitors. Himselfe also and Allen and diuers other Masse-priests consorted themselues with the Spaniards, and other publike enemies, that anno, 1588. and at other times came to cut their country mens throtes, and to spoile their country. Neither do we find any were more straitely linked with Northren and Irish rebels, assassins, empoisoners, cutthrote inquisitors, then they. All Papists hold communion with Popes, Cardinals, Monkes Friars & Masse-priests. Yet can not Parsons deny but that Iohn the 12. Landus, Sergius the third, Clement the fifth, Iohn the 22. and 23. Innocent the eight, Alexander the sixth, Paul the third and diuers other Popes are condemned in stories for their adulteries, fornications, purloinings, theueries, and notorious impieties. Lately they haue bene conuinced of most inhumane, and neuer heard of before, treasons against the Prince and state.

Finally

Finally, the more rigour and cruelty Arundell, Gardiner, Bonner, Thorneton and such like bloody cutthroats shewed to the saints of God, the more they please Parsons, and his polshorne mates.

In the same place he hath no better reason to proue Sir Iohn Oldcastle, Sir Roger Acton, and others to be rebels and traitors, then for that by the Lawes they were condemned, and executed for rebellion and treason. Why then should not the Monkes, and Masse priests, that were Captaine-rebels in King Henry the eight his reigne, and Campian, Sherwine, Ballard, Cottan, Arden, Norton, and others that were executed in the late Quenes time for treason, and our Gun-powder Martyrs be reputed traitors? Were not their facts by law iudged and taken for treason? And were they not tried, condemned and executed as traitors? Beside al this, their facts declare them traitors, incurring the danger of ancient Lawes against treason. How then can Parsons open his mouth in defence of his owne consorts, that vpon so small grounds condemneth his aduersaries?

He telleth also, how the Waldensians, Wickleffistes, Lutherans & others are coupled together for Martyrs in our calendar. But first these are nicknames deuised by our enemies, and not acknowledged by vs, or the parties to whom they are giuen: and next the same matter may with farre better reason be alleged against the Iebusites, Dominicans, Franciscans, Carthusians, and other Monkes, the Cardinals and other Priests of Babel, and all the rifferaffe orders, and sects of the Romish Church. For albeit they differ in rules, opinions, and course of life; yet the Pope embraceth of all of them some, and placeth them, as his deare darlings in his triumphant visible Church of Papolatrians, and many of them enterprise deliperatly for his seruice: as appeared lately by our powder-men and miners.

Speaking against heretikes, he saith, the Apostle calleth heretikes adulterers for depraying and adulterating the word of God, and that he would haue them auoided. He addeth further, that Saint Iohn would not haue them receiued into

our

our houses, nor so much as God speede you, said vnto them. But this is as much, as if he should condemne himselfe and his consorts for adulterers. For no sort of heretikes did euer deprauе and adulterate the word of God more grossely and shamefully, then the Popes Masse-priests, and Masling popish parasites. As hereunto the actes and stories, wherein their fornications and filthinesse is discouered, and then they will appeare not only Metaphoricall, but literall adulterers, and fornicators. Further if heretikes are to be auoided, and not so much, as God spæde said vnto them, why are the adulterous Masse-priests and Iebusites and Powder-men receiued into mens houses? why should any help to spæd them, or say God spæde them?

The particulars of the old calendar, which he like an old and forlorne lanterne maker, setteth downe in his idle treatise, doe either all or most of them make against the cause of Papists. For neither the holy Apostle, nor Prophets, nor yet the ancient Martyrs, and doctors of the Church did euer teach the gallimafry diuinity of the Popish scholes, or receiue, or know the doctrine of Popish decretales concerning the monarchy and deity of the Pope, the Masse, the worship of saints, their new sacraments, and other such like points. May the Prelates, Monkes, and Friers of the popish church that liued before our times were not acquainted with the poison of the conuenticle of Trent, nor the faith professed by Pius the fourth as it differeth from our Crаd.

In his double Calendar vpon the eight of March, he saith, that Felix, that first conuerted the East Angles, that is, Norfolke and Suffolke, came from Burgundy. But therein he giueth a maine blow to his owne babling discourse of three conuersions of England from Rome. For if so great a part of England were conuerted by one comming from Burgundy, then that obligation which he pretendeth betwixt vs and Rome is cassed, and made void by his owne confession. Neither is it materiall, that Bede lib. hist. Angl. c. 15. maketh mention of his sending by Honorius Archbishop of Canterbury. For what is that to Rome? Beside that, how is his

suppolall

suppositall proued contradicting other writers.

The 12. of March is assigned to Gregory the first, and of him Parsons saith, that his learning and charity stretched vnto England. But if he had not dreamed, he would neuer haue said this of Gregorius. For therein we see, how much later Popes are degenerated from their ancestors. Gregory the first sent men into England to teach, late Popes haue sent men into England, Ireland, Germany and France, to cut Christian mens throates, and to blow them vp with gunpowder. Gregory had learning and charity, now Popes commonly are void of both.

Vpon the 20. of March is Cutbert dignified in the Calendar, who, as Parsons saith, was chosen Bishop of Lindisferne by a synode, and after two yeares left his place. But if Bishops may be chosen by synodes, and of their owne authority leaue their places, then what will become of the Popes exorbitant authority in confirming and preferring bishops, and dispensing with them to leaue their places?

On the fift of Ianuary speaking of King Edward the Confessor, he saith, that Alexander the third did canonize him, and that Pope Innocent the fourth appointed his day to be kept holy day. The which ouerthroweth the forme of canonization of saints now practised. For now euery one, that is canonized, hath his feast and holy day appointed. Then one did canonize saints, and another appoint holy daies. Further, this sheweth, that the Pope canonizeth men vnknowen.

Vpon the 27. of Iune he saith, that Crescens, that preached many yeares in France & Germany, was a disciple of Paul, and by him sent thither. But this being so, we doe see, that the Gospell came not into the Westerne world from Rome only, as the false decretale *quis nesciat dist.* 11. affirmeth, but from other Apostles.

Pag. 3. to proue, that we ought to returne to the Romish Church, and to the worship of saints, he alledgeth the words of the prodigall sonne Luc. 15. I will goe to my father. But these words doe quite ouerthrow his purpose, shewing that

we are to goe to God, and not to saints, nor any other, but God. Of the synagogue of Masse-priests there is not the least signification in these words.

Pag. 6. he indeuoreth to proue praiers to saints by certaine words Hester 6. But he mistaketh Hester for Mardochey, and alledgeth his example for praier to saints, and their intercession, that praieth only to God, without any mention of intercession to saints. For he praieth thus only, *Domine deus Abraham miserere populi tui*, that is, ô Lord God of Abraham haue mercy on thy people.

Pag. 31. he proueth the vse of the Roman Calendar out of Macrobius, and deriueth it from the Pagans; which sheweth that the trickes of the Church of Rome concerning worship of Saints, are deriued rather from Pagans, then from Christians.

Pag. 37. and 38. he sheweth, how corrupted Legends of saints were forbidden by Gelasius dist. 15. c. sancta. *Ne vel leuis subsannandi oriretur occasio*, that is, least any light occasion might be giuen of mocking. But this doth vtterly ouerthrow the practise of the Church of Rome, that admitteth not only most ridiculous fables, but also the legends of George, Cyricus and Iulitta and Tecla, which Gelasius there condemneth.

Pag. 42. he telleth how George Archbishop of Alexandria burnt the canons of the councell of Nice, and being slaine was honoured as a Martyr by those of his sect. All which maketh against the Papists. For if they be to be esteemed wicked men, that burne the canons of Councels, what are we to thinke of the Papists that burne canonicall scriptures? If those which worship George bishop of Alexandria, be to be reputed heretikes; then are the Papists heretikes and damnable fellowes, by the opinion of Parsons. For their S. George is he, that stroue against Athanasius; and no other, then this George, that is honored as a Martyr. Further that is a common practise of Papists to honor their consorts or Martyrs, albeit they be execrable heretikes.

Pag. 147. he obiecteth vnto those, which he calleth Puritans

tans, as great heresies, that they hold, that by Gods lawes temporall Princes may not haue supreme authority in the church, and that the people hath power to punish, put downe or put to death Princes that offend. Whereof the first is held by all Papists, the second by Parsons in his seditious booke of titles, vnder the counterfet name of Doleman, and is indeede a most turbulent and seditious assertion. The Puritans further answere, that they are most vniustly slandered.

Pag. 156. he saith, If pertinacy be absent, that heresie cannot be heresie. And yet his bloody consorts haue murdred many Christians, as heretikes, albeit they alwaies shewed themselues willing to be taught, yea and to yeld, if their opinions could be refuted by the word of God.

Pag. 160. the testimony of S. Bernard hom. 66. in Cant. is alledged against vs. But the same serueth better against the Papists. For they forbid certaine meates, and condemne Mariages as the Apostolikes did. Neither is it sufficient, that they be heretikes, vnlesse they be also hypocrites, as the other were.

Pag. 208. and 209. Parsons most falsely obiecteth to Castellane the raising of sedition, and Apostasy; whereas his owne practise for many yeares hath beene to raise sedition, and the life of the Popish league in France was nothing but mutiny and rebellion. He himselfe also, and diuers of his consorts hauing long professed religion, vpon hope of preferment, or priuat discontentment haue plaid the Apostates from religion to Popery.

Pag. 212. he obiecteth to M. Whittle, that he was a maried Priest. The same also is a common obiection to diuers godly Martyrs, that suffered death for the truth in Queene Maries daies. And yet he cannot deny, that saint Peter had a daughter, and so yong that she must nedes be begotten after his Apostleship. It is apparent also, that diuers of the Apostles and ancient Bishops were maried. But that they forsoke the company of their wiues it cannot be proued.

Pag. 214. and 215. he obiecteth to Browne and Went, that they were artificers, and to Tudson, that he was an appren-

tice. And yet he and his fellowes would gladly hold communion with the old Martyrs, that were men of trade, and plaine Christians.

Pag. 284. speaking against Luther he produceth Cochleus, Surius and Genebrard his fellow theeues for witnesses against him. Let him therefore admitte the testimony of our writers, that write against the Pope, and then he shall see the Popes cause is ouerthrowen.

Pag. 286. he mentioneth Luthers dispute with the Diuel. And yet in the second councell of Nice, and in the conformities of Francis and diuers Legends, his consorts the Papists haue vsed the testimony of the Diuell.

Pag. 380 speaking of diuers reuerend prelates he accuseth them for hauing euery one his woman. And yet euery one of these women were their lawfull wiues. Let then the Papists iudge, what an accuser this fellow would be, if he were to speake against the Pope, or the Masse-priests, which for the most part haue diuers women & those vnlawfully, being not maried vnto them.

Pag. 471. he sleareth and laugheth at Master Fox for putting downe a Martyr not named. And yet in the Romish Martyrologe sometime they put downe 40. sometimes hundreds, sometime thousands of Martyrs together, and yet none of them named.

In his epistle to the reader he talketh of sundry falsifications, which he pretendeth to be committed by Master Fox, and the end of his redoubled relation is to charge Master de Plessis with false dealing. But he hath so behaued himselfe in this, and other treatises published by him, that I doe not thinke, that a more impudent lier, and forger can be found in the whole packe of Iebusites. Whatsoeuer therefore he inueigheth against falsification, and false dealing, the same falleth most iustly vpon his owne pate. This he may speake for his glory, that if a Pope were to be chosen out of false forgers, none could weare the Triple crowne sooner, then Parsons.

In the examination of the places out of Scotus and Durand

rand M. Plessis was wrongfully charged with taking the obiection for the resolution. But whosoeuer looketh into the railing discourse of Parsons against the godly Martyrs of the Church of Christ; he shall find, that continually he taketh the articles for the parties answeres, and chargeth the parties with whatsoeuer is conteined in the articles. Which is a farre grosser fault, then to take the obiection for the resolution; especially when the same is confirmed in the resolution.

Pag. 89. Master Plessis is charged with deprauing Chrysostomes meaning, and drawing from him a contrary conclusion. But Parsons commonly citeth authors, that make nothing for his purpose, depraueth both their words and their meaning, and draweth conclusions from them, not only neuer thought vpon by the fathers, but also contrary to their meaning and doctrine: and of this I haue giuen diuers instances both in this, and in other bookes written against Parsons. Neither are any of his consorts able to cleare themselues from this accusation.

Pag. 96. of Parsons his relation, M. Plessis is charged with fraud and corruption for leauing out a clause. But as he is charged most vniustly, so Parsons and his consorts are charged most iustly, and by their violent fury against others ouerthrow themselues with their owne sentence.

Pag. 99. he is further accused by Parsons for attributing words to Cyrill, that are not found in Cyrill, and putting them in a different letter. A matter common to Bellarmine, Parsons and others of that sect.

In his conclusion Pag. 194 he obiecteth foolish vanting to me, himselfe for his glorious brags being infamous both to friends and enemies.

Finally, he is very desirous, that a triall and dispute be made concerning true and false allegations, and certaine points of religion in controuersie, and yet will not offer vs nor procure vs the like triall and conference and with like conditions in Italy, France and Spaine.

To bring al his allegations and arguments of this kinde

it were infinit. for commonly where he thinketh to stop one hole, he layeth open another, and argueth no lesse against himselfe, then against vs.

CHAP. XI.

An answer to Parsons *railing and reuiling termes.*

IN answering of Parsons his railing termes, we doe labour in vaine, if we respect him. But we purposed not so much to lay open his vnfaithfull dealing, and malicious course which is apparent to all, as to declare the innocency of the parties falsely by him accused, to all that shall reade our answer. Hierome writing against Vigilantius, for his defence doth alledge the very same reason. *Nunc aerem verberauimus* saith he, *& non tam illius infidelitatem, quæ omnibus patet, quàm nostram fidem aperuimus.* Now wee haue bette the aire, and haue not so much opened his infidelity, which lieth open to all men, as our owne faithfull dealing.

In his epistle dedicatory abusing a place of scripture, he saith, that Master Fox hath brought himselfe and vs into a society of a most infamous company of condemned heretikes, and wicked malefactors. But we must know, that our Sauiour Christ was also condemned for a blasphemer, and reputed among malefactors. Neither could the holy Apostles escape the censures of the Scribes and Pharisees, nor the ancient Martyrs of Christ auoid the scourge of the malicious tongues of Pagans, and wicked Atheistes. What then if the Pharisees and Scribes of the Popish synagogue haue condemned innocent Christians as heretikes and malefactors? Not their malicious sentence, or slanders, but the true causes of their condemnation are to be examined.

That famous and noble Captaine Zizca, this infamous and base Popish parasite calleth, the famous Bohemian murtherer. And yet who so list to reade his true history shall finde, that he killed none, but such as came to murther the innocent. Being forced by the perfidiousnesse of the Pope,

and

and his complices, he toke armes for his owne necessarie defence, and the protection of the innocent, against the malice of the polesherne Priests, idle and slow bellied Monkes, the lying and railing Friers, who haue no cause to raile vpon Zizca, vnlesse it were, because he would not suffer them to massacre Christian people at their pleasure, and without resistance.

He raileth against vs, as if we were made companions of theeues, and had our portion with adulterers, and were thus handled by Master Fox. But we haue heretofore cleared Christs holy Martyrs from the imputations of this impure slaue of Antichrist. Let him also, and his consorts cleare themselues from this accusation, as well as we if they can, and shew that they haue no part with sacrilegious theeues, that both robbe Christians of the word of God, and of the cup of the new testament, and of their temporall goods. Their inquisitors are cutthrots and murderers. The Popes and Popish Notaries and Masse-priests are by diuers records of stories declared to be a packe of fornicators, adulterers and sodomites.

Castellane in the double calendar vpon the 11. of Ianuary is called a French Apostata Friar. But Parsons had no reason being an English Apostata from religion, and a fugitiue out of his country, and denized French by a charter sealed with a scurup stampe, to obiect this to him. He obiecteth also to M. Whittle vpon the 12. of Ianuary, that he was a renegate maried Priest. As if it were not farre more honest to renounce Antichrist, then to renounce his country; to liue a maried Priest, then to die a cankred Lecher, or filthy sodomite.

To Iohn Tudson on the 14. of Ianuary, he obiecteth obstinacy and arrogancy. To Richard Houedem February 7. wicked and phantasticall articles of religion. To Doctor Veselus March the 3. that he was a libertine priest. To Master Patricke Hamilton March. 8. that he held blasphemous opinions. To some, madnesse, to others ignorance and simplicity. So this libertine Friar taketh to himselfe liberty to raile against the saints of God, whose patience, mildenesse, and

constancy in the true faith, as it was admirable to all men, so the arrogancy, pride, cruelty and blasphemies of their persecutors shall make them infamous and execrable to all posterity.

Master Foxes Calendar is called a wild hog-field of husked saints, Pag. 3. and yet they were not canonized by the wild bore that rooteth vp the vineyard of the Lord, nor fed vpon the huskes of the Popes traditions, nor may they be deemed wild, that were apprehended and cruelly murdred by their bloody enemies. But as for the Monks and Friars canonized by the Pope, and such hog-saints and dog-saints, they may well be said to be placed in the wild hog-field of husked saints being fed with the huskes of humane traditions, and canonized by the Diuels hogheard the Pope, and put into his field of wild and vntamed persecutors of saints.

Pag. 55. he talketh of a posterity of the English nation, that should defie and detest both Master Foxes martyrs, and their doctrine, and display their wickednesse to the world. But they are a race of renegates, of the slaues of Antichrist, of such as haue solde themselues to worke wickednesse, and to raile against innocents. But as they are detested of all good men, and true louers of their country, in this world; so if they repent not, they are to expect a heauy iudgment in the world to come. And to that doome I doe refer them.

Pag. 65. he commeth in again with his Theeues, Manquellers, Witches and Sorcerers, Necromancers and open rebels. But the weak subiect of his accusation wil not beare half these great words. The parties by him charged were either falsely said to be of our religion, or wrongfully accused by the Papists of no religion nor conscience. But if we looke backe into the histories of Popes and Cardinals, and al the rakehelly route of Masse-priests, Monks, and Friars, there we may find, that which he seeketh amongst vs, and that testified not by enemies, that had cause to say the worst, but by friends that concealed as much as they could the infirmities of their owne sect, and diminished their vices.

The third chapter of his examen, wherein he calleth some of

of vs Waldenſians, ſome Albigenſians, ſome Wickleffians, ſome Lutherans, ſome Anabaptiſts and ſuch like termes, is nothing elſes but a diſcourſe fraught with malicious woꝛds pꝛoceꝛding from a cankered ſtomacke of a diſtempered friar. The termes we ſcoꝛne, the authoꝛs we defie, the diuerſity of opinions and ſects we deny. But if we loke among the Papiſts, we ſhall find that ſome are of one ſect of Friars, and otheꝛs of another. Some follow Thomas, ſome Scotus, ſome hold the pꝛiuat opinions of Bellarmine oꝛ Suarez: ſome follow the canoniſts, ſome the ſchoolemen. Neither doe the popiſh ſects deny the names of Dominicans, Franciſcans, Benedictins, and of their particular oꝛders.

If he raile againſt Luther, Zuinglius Caluin, Farrel & other good men ſtirred vp by God to detect the filthines of the great whoꝛe, it is no maruell. For the good are an abomination to the wicked. Furthermoꝛe, being an Apoſtata from religion, and the ſonne of a lewd woman, and a renegued Engliſhman, and the Popes parаſite, what are we to expect at his hands, but malicious inuectiues againſt religion, and gloſing diſcourſes in commendation of the whoꝛiſh religion of Rome, and odious termes againſt his countrimen, that pꝛofeſſe the truth, and bitter gall degoꝛged out of his filthy ſtomacke againſt the enemies of the Pope? Let vs rather conſider, that the moſt that he obiecteth is matter deuiſed out of his owne head; the reſt is teſtified by Cochleus, Surius, Balduinus, Boliſecke, and ſuch wicked companions, whom either hunger, oꝛ hope enfoꝛceth to deuiſe lies.

Pag. 230. holy Martyꝛs are termed by him fond madlings, fol. 291. ſuch as mainteined the truth againſt the Pope together with Luther are diſgraced, as if they were nothing but Poets, Grammarians, Schoolemaſters, Plaiers, Painters, and other ſuch like light people. But to carnall woꝛdlings it is no maruell, if the painfull life of Chriſtians ſeeme madneſſe. In the end they will acknowledg their own courſes to be folly & madnes, and cry out as the wicked enemies of the Church doe Sap. 5. *nos inſenſati &c.* We ſenſeleſſe people thought their life madneſſe. Parſons in his furi-

ous

ous course of libelling and railing doth rather shew himselfe a mad Masse-priest, and worthy a place in Bedlem, then a sober diuine to be placed as a Cardinall in the Popes consistory.

Page. 317. the reuerend father bishop Hooper a most holie martyr is by him termed a new fangled, libertine heretike, and maister Rogers, Pag. 325. called a bold, turbulent, seditious spirit. but what is this cur, that barketh thus doggedlie against the saints of God? if you will see his currish nature perfectlie described, then read the discourses of the secular Priestes against him. consider also further, how new fangled hee is, that hath changed so many religions and countries. that he is a libertine in life, his lose cariage testified by the masse Priests will declare. that heis a libertine in language it will appeare by diuers of his in famous libels. hee will say, hee is no heretike, and yet he holdeth all those opinions of the Romish synagogue, which are declared to be heresies; & answereth nothing, vnlesse silence be an answer. Of his boldnesse, his audacious attemptes against his Prince and country giue sufficient testimony. Only his running out of England declareth him a coward, and nothing desirous to be Calendred among the Popes Martyrs. Finally, since he came with the Popes faculties to stirre trouble, his continuall study hath beene to procure warres and troubles to his country. What shame then had he, trow you, to talke of these matters?

Finally, his whole discourse both against the godly Martyrs, that suffered in time past for testifying the truth against the kingdome of Antichrist, and also against all that fauour the truth and detest the filthy abominations of that state, is nothing but slandring and rayling. For libelling and rayling he is become famous, or rather infamous. I say therefore to him as Hierome said to Heluidius. *Consequutus es quod voluisti, nobilis factus es in scelere.* Thou hast obteined thy desire: thou art become famous for villany. And for this fault I leaue him to the censure of indifferent Iudges in this world, and in the world to come to the iudgement of him that

that shall iudge both quicke and dead, and will iudge most vprightly.

CHAP. XII.

A reply vpon Parsons *his defence of his late relation from* Rome *concerning the conference betwixt the* L. *of* Plessis Marly, *and* M. Peron *pretended Bishop of* Eureux, *together with an answer to his Conclusion concerning a like course taken by* Ph. Woodward *to a challenge set out against the Iebusites and all their complices.*

THe old Grammarians and interpreters of Homer, as we may read in their Commentaries and expositions, were wont to talke much of the miseries of Troy, a towne long besæged, and at the last taken, spoiled, and destroied. But they considered not in the meane while their owne poore, hungry and miserable estate, who being vered with hunger, pouerty and want, lined most wretchedly. Of this humor seemeth Parsons to be. For albeit he standeth charged with diuers lies, falsifications and forgeries, and is notoriously conuicted thereof by the iudgement of all indifferent readers; yet as a man carelesse of his owne faults and miserable errors, he is still very busie in talking of other mens escapes, that concerne him little or nothing. Now the second time he hath sent vs his relation from Rome concerning a conference passed in France betwixt the Lord Plessis and Master Peron. ἰατρὲ θεράπευσον σεαυτόν. So pretending to cure others, himself appeareth full of botches and sores. But reason would he should haue said somewhat in defence of himselfe, and of his owne doings. Vnto his second relation he hath also added a defence of the first. And vnto this we are now to reply. Not that we neede any long discourse to conuince

uince him of falſehood, and ſolery (for what nede we to ſay much againſt him, that altereth his firſt relation himſelfe being grounded only vpon hearesay and certaine letters from Paris to Rome; and confeſſeth, that the ſecond was framed by Peron himſelfe, who in his owne cauſe is a partiall witneſſe) but only briefely to declare his vanity and folly, that maketh ſo much of nothing, and catcheth at ſhadowes leauing the ſubſtance.

But before we come to examine the places for the which M. Pleſſis was challenged, we muſt pray the reader to conſider, with what preiudice Maſter Pleſſis vndertoke this quarrell. And ſo we ſhall rather maruell, that he acquited himſelfe ſo nobly, then acknowledg the enemy to haue gained the victory. Firſt then, we muſt conſider, that this was a party made againſt Maſter Pleſſis by his enemies. Parſons himſelfe confeſſeth p. 75. that the King threatned to proceed againſt him in his abſence, if he would not come forth to iuſtifie his booke in all points.

Secondly, not only the iudges were partiall, but alſo the auditory. Hardly could Maſter Pleſſis be heard with patience of his Iudges, & the auditory, whether he ſaid well or euill, was ready to laugh and hiſſe. he might haue done well to haue thought before, that he was to anſwer in the midſt of his enemies.

Thirdly, his aduerſaries knew well, what to obiect, and had great leiſure to conſider of it. But Maſter Pleſſis was forced to anſwer vpon a few houres warning, and had no time to conſider of his defences.

Fourthly, it was ſufficient for the aduerſary to chuſe out ſome few places out of many. But Maſter Pleſſis muſt make good his whole booke, which now he hath done to the whole world, and his quarrelling aduerſarie doth rather barke at it, then take vpon him to refute it. Parſons may doe well to ſpeake to it now, if he can.

Finally, being from his owne library he was forced to vſe his aduerſaries bookes, wherein they practiſed double fraud, not only ſhewing him one booke ouernight, and another in the

the morning, but putting a ponder in the places quoted, the smell whereof had like to haue cost him his life.

If either Bellarmine, or Baronius, or any writer of the aduersaries side should haue disputed with the like disaduantage, I doe not thinke, but they would haue complained more, and departed from the combat with lesse honor. For whatsoeuer either this paltry companion, or other of the Popes faction haue most falsely giuen out of their victory at Fontainebrean, yet all things considered their gaine will appeare to be nothing. Parsons himselfe will not say if he be mistaken in alledging of 9. or 900. places, that his cause is therefore the worse. Why then doth he make such a stirre about 9. places? And why are not the rest brought forth? Nay what if Master Plessis haue dealt faithfully in the places examined? Will not this cocke forbeare to crow so loud vpon a vaine supposall of his fellow crauens victory?

Let vs then see both what passed, and what is reported, and how it is defended. Iohn Scot saith, Master Plessis was not afraid to call in question, whether Christs body be really contained vnder the formes, and disputeth that it is not. And therein Peron supposeth, that he committed two wilfull and malicious deceites. The first, for that Scotus disputing this matter setteth down, that it is simply a substantiall article of our faith, to beleeue that Christs body is truly and really there vnder these accidents: the second, for that the arguments supposed to be brought by Scotus were the arguments of heretikes. To this I answer, first, that this allegation was impertinent, because Peron tooke vpon him to proue falsifications, and not mistakings or deceits. I might also haue charged both Peron and the relater, with falsification. For Scotus saith not, that Christs body is really vnder the accidents, as they affirme, but *sub specie panis* that is, vnder the kind of bread, which in terms of good Latin construction importeth rather substance, then accidents, as in my booke de Missa I haue proued by the testimony of diuers Latine Fathers. Secondly, I might charge them also with lying. For Scotus doth not affirme, that the arguments brought by

by him are the arguments of Heretikes, as they say of him. I answered secondly, that Master Plessis did rightly alledge Scotus, and that although as schoolemen most seruilly are wont to doe, he yelded to the Popes determination, yet he rather held against the being of Christs body by transubstantiation in the Eucharist, then with it. And that is proued not only by his weake answers vnto his owne arguments, but also by the confession of the aduersaries, and his owne words. Bellarmine lib. 3. de Euchar. c. 23. relateth that Scotus held, that God could haue made Christs body to be in the sacrament together with the bread. And so doth Dominicus à Soto vnderstand Scotus. The man himselfe saith, that so the mystery would haue beene more easie. He holdeth also, that transubstantiation was no article of faith before the councel of Lateran, nor can be proued by scriptures, without the determination of the Church. Finally, he saith expresly, that he beleeued this conclusion because of the determination of the Church. which implieth, that he was not thereto forced by argument. *Teneo conclusionem*, saith he, Report. lib. 4. dist. 11. q. 3. *quia ecclesia tenet.*

Against this obiection R. Parsons maketh a most sclie defence, saying first, that these are two poore shifts, forasmuch as Peron did not charge M. Plessis with misciting his words, but for peruerting his meaning and setting downe his obiection for his resolution. But he shal find that they are no shifts, but sound answers, and such as plainly auoid Parsons obiections. In the meane while he declareth himselfe to want eyes, who talketh of misciting of Scotus his words, which I do not so much as mention. For I speake only of a collection out of his words, and not of misciting them. Therein also he pleadeth for vs, where he confesseth, that the words of Scotus are not misced. Further absurdlie he talketh of peruerting the meaning of Scotus his words. For M. Plessis doth not bring them to interpret them, but to conclude from them. Neither was he ignorant what was his obiection, what his resolution, but he gathereth his meaning from the whole frame and course of his dispute. But saith Parsons, if Plessis be a man of any

any learning, or common sense at all, this his mistaking &c, cannot be censured for lesse then wilfull imposture. I answer, if Parsons be a man of any learning or sense at al, thē his mistaking in so many places is by his confession to be censured for wilfull imposture. Here also he misstaketh me. For I say not, that he is mistaken, but that albeit his aduersarie should proue mistaking, yet he could not proue the matters obiected against him.

He chargeth me further, for that speaking of the reall presence, I adde these words, by transubstantiation. But his quarrell is very idle and vaine. For albeit to Papists the reall presence is one thing, and transubstantiation another; yet because they hold that Christs body is really present in the Sacrament by transubstantiation of the bread into his body, it followeth necessarily, that if Scotus doe wauer in transubstantiation, that he cannot firmely hold the Popish reall presence. False therefore it is, that I gaue *quid pro quo*: and very true, that Parsons neither vnderstandeth *quid*, nor *quo*.

The second place supposed to be falsified by M. Plessis is taken out of Durand. But Parsons, while he goeth about to maintaine the charge, doth himselfe falsifie M. Plessis his words, leauing out two sentences alledged out of Durand; and following these words, called by them of Sorbone, the most resolute Doctor; he maketh him also to call the Doctors of Sorbone our Sorbonists: which he neuer wrot, nor thought. Further he doth most falsely obiect to Master Plessis, that he tooke the obiection for his resolution. For albeit in termes he resolue for transubstantiation, yet bringing nothing, but the determination of the lurking synod of Lateran, and two or three fathers speaking nothing to the purpose; yet his weake arguments for it, and his strong obiections against it doe shew, what he would haue said, if he had beene free from the Popes censure. And the rather for that granting, that the bread is transubstantiated formally and not materially, he doth quite ouerthrow that, which in words before he had granted. Parsons, therefore, when he saith that Durand held a particular opinion, which is nothing to our controuersie,

troversie, speaketh he knoweth not what. For he that granteth, that the matter of bread and wine remaineth after consecration, doth vtterly deny Popish transubstantiation.

The third place alleaged by M. Plessis, and supposed to be taken out of S. Chrysostoms 1. Homily in 1. Thess. 1. I say, is not falsely alleaged, because he doth not recite his words. But saith Parsons, hee leaueth out those words, that make against him. As if a man could leaue out some words, who doth not rehearse his words at all. It appeareth, that Parsons his vnderstanding hath left him. Hee saith also, that he draweth a quite contrary conclusion to that, which Chrysostome did make. But hee maketh a report contrary to truth. For Chrysostomes words are these, we must not put all our hope in praiers of Saints. And he speaketh not of saints departed this life, but of liuing Saints. Of these words then which are a part of Chrysostomes conclusion, M. Plessis collecteth this corollary rightly, that if we may not trust altogether to the praiers of saints in this life, we may lesse trust to the praiers of saints departed, of which we are vncertaine whether they heare vs particularly, or particularly pray for vs, or not. where Parsons therefore confesseth, that he chargeth Master Plessis with greater crimes then impertinency, he sheweth himselfe guilty of calumniation, that obiecting great crimes proueth neither great, nor litle. Where he chargeth me with leauing out the word wholy out of Chrysostomes words, he sheweth himselfe deuoid of common sense. For I cite Master Plessis conclusion out of Chrysostomes words, and not the erpresse and formall words of Chrysostome. Beside that the word of relying doth import as much as trusting wholy. For if Parsons rely vpon the Popes words for his Cardinals hat, a man may say truly, that he trusteth wholy vpon the Pope for that matter. Thus haue we ridde our selues out of Parsons his impure fingers. But you shall see, that he shall not easily escape out of our hands. For first, in his ralation Pag. 88. and 89. these words, where Chrysostome handling these words &c. and these, Plessis saith, that whereas the Papists &c. hang not together. Secondly, these

words

wordes in his homily vpon the first of Saint Pauls epistles to the Thessalonians, doe import that he supposeth him to haue written only one homily vpon the first to the Thessalonians, which argueth his ignorance. Thirdly, these wordes of Chrysostome are not taken out of the 1. homily vpon the 1. epist. of Saint Paul to the Thessalonians, but out of his 5. Homily vpon Saint Matthew. Fourthly, Chrysostome in Hom. 5. in Matth. doth not handle these wordes of Hierome, if Moyses, &c. but rather the example of the Cananite, and from the same, and the wordes of Hieremy concludeth, that we are not to trust altogether in the prayers of saints. Finally, this false iugler would turne Chrysostomes wordes vttered of prayers to liue saints, to proue prayers to saints departed, of which there is no inckling in that place.

The fourth place challenged by Peron, as falsely alledged by Master Plessis out of the fifth homily of Saint Chrysostome vpon Saint Matthewes Gospel, may easily be iustified. For neither doth he leaue out any wordes, that are pertinent to the purpose; nor doth he conclude vnsufficiently. Not the first, because, albeit Chrysostome afterward doe allow prayers to holy men liuing, yet he condemneth those, that trust wholy on the prayers and merits of others; which is the case of Papists, among whom theeues, whoores, whoremongers, and most grieuous sinners trust to the intercession of saints, and as diuers legends tell vs, haue receiued releefe and fauour by them. Not the second, for that lesse we are to trust to the prayers of saints departed, then to the mediation of holy men yet liuing. Let this shifter therefore leaue his clamours of shameleesse shifting, and by arguments shift off our answers. As for his conclusion out of my wordes, it is most vaine and ridiculous. I doe say we are not so to rely vpon saints, and to pray to them, as the Church of Rome doth. And of this he would conclude, that I allow some certaine measure of praier to saints if it be moderate: but he may as well conclude, that some measure of idolatry is tolerable, because we say, that idols are not to be worshipped, as the Church of Rome doth worship them. He would also enforce

vpon me a grant, as if our argument from Chrysostome against Popish prayers were confessed not to be good, because I say, if it were granted, that it were not good. But he may as well conclude, that I grant him to be a Cardinall, if I should say, were it granted, that this bastard were made Cardinall.

In his relation about the contention concerning the fifth place challenged by Peron, Parsons himselfe committeth diuers grosse faults. For First, he saith, that M. Plessis alledged the same, as an antidotum to other sayings of S. Hierome in fauour of praying to saints in his book against Vigilantius. But neither doth Master Plessis alledge it for that cause, knowing well, how litle Saint Hierome fauored Popish prayers to saints, nor hath Hierome one word in that treatise, that proueth directly prayers to saints. Secondly, he misreporteth the words of Master Plessis, making him to say, Saint Hierome in his Commentaries, when he was out of choler did write thus, if we haue confidence in any one &c. he saith only: in his commentaries expounding these words of the Prophet, if these three men, Noe, Daniel and Iob, &c. Thirdly, he would make men beleue, that these words, *si fuerint negligentes*, are part of the sentence cited by Master Plessis: which is not so. Fourthly, in these words, *nec principes nos poterunt liberare*, he imagineth ridiculously, that Hierome spoke of principall saints: the word being meant of the great Princes of the world. Fifthly, he denieth, that Hierome in that place speaketh of the prayers of saints aliue: which is plainly proued by these words, *tres viri &c.* these three men, if they shall be there. Sixthly, he maketh Master Plessis to confesse, that Hierome in his booke against Vigilantius talketh of prayers to saints deceased, which he expressely denieth. Seuenthly, he affirmeth, that this text alledged out of Saint Hierome maketh nothing against the Popish doctrine of prayers to saints: which assertion is refuted by infinit tales out of Popish Legends, where Saints are said to helpe their clients, albeit negligent, carelesse, dead and in Purgatory. But Hierome saith they deliuer not, if men be negligent. 8. he

saith

saith that Master Plessis leapt to another place of Saint Hieromes vpon Saint Pauls epistles to the Corinthians, where he saith, that saints shal not be able to help at the day of iudgement. But first he belieth Master Plessis, and misalledgeth the epistle to the Corinthians, for the epistle to the Galathians. Next in the commentaries vpon that epistle he speaketh not of the generall iudgement, but of euery particular mans iudgement vpon his departure out of the world. Lastly, he talketh absurdly of foure falsifications more, which Peron vanted he would proue out of this place, seeing neither of both is able to make good this one.

In his defence of his relation, wherein notwithstanding he cleareth none of these matters, he quarrelleth with me, first for my obscurity. But the more plainely matters are deliuered, the more will his owne shame appeare. I doe not deale so obscurely, but that euery man may vnderstand, that Master Plessis is charged with leauing out these words of Hierome, lib. 4. in Ezech. c. 14. if they be negligent. I doe answer also plainly, that these words are not materiall. And proue it, first, for that the ordinary glosse doth leaue them out. And next, for that in that place Hierome speaketh of the praiers of holy Prophets, if they were aliue. And condemneth all that trust in the praiers of others be they diligent or negligent. But he most falsely addeth to Hieroms words, that if the children of holy parents be diligent, then their praiers will auaile them. Which neither Hierome, nor Chrysostome, vpon whom they are fathered, euer thought. He talketh also of our cooperation with saints praiers, and not once mentioneth Gods grace. Which sauoureth strongly of Pelagianisme.

Secondly, he taketh exception to this argument. We must not trust in men. *Ergo*, not in saints. But vnlesse he adde his owne patcheries vnto it of negligence and diligence, and so make it his owne argument, the same will stand, when al his pride shall fall.

Thirdly, he telleth vs of 12. places of fathers for defence of praiers to saints. But I haue shewed, that although Bel-

larmine haue alledged more; yet he hath brought no one, that is concludent, or any way sufficient to proue Popish praiers to saints.

Fourthly, he denieth, that the words of Hierome lib. 2. in epist. ad Galat. maketh against praiers to saints. And his reason is, for that he saith the praiers of saints anaile nothing in the day of iudgement. But how can he shew, that they anaile lesse then, then at other times? againe, it cannot be proued, that he speaketh of the generall iudgement, rather then of euery mans particular iudgement.

Finally, for proofe of praiers to Saints he alledgeth most fondly the words of Hierome against Vigilantius, where he sheweth, that saints in heauen pray for vs. This I say is a fond allegation. For all the Angels and Saints in heauen pray for the Church on earth. But we reade not, that the Church on earth praieth to saints in heauen. Neither doe we pray to men absent, and that cannot heare vs, albeit they may pray for vs being absent.

The sixth quotation of Master Plessis, which is out of Cyril, is iustified, first, for that he quoteth not Cyril for saying in expresse termes, that adoration was not to be yelded to the signe of the crosse, but rather because the same may be proued out of his answer to Iulian. I said also, that Iulian was reproued of extreme ignorance, for obiecting to Christians the worship of the crosse, and proued out of Minutius Felix, that the primitiue Church neither desired to haue Crosses, nor to worship crosses. Now then see, I pray you, what Parsons bringeth out for his further defence. First, he saith, that all this is refuted both in the acts, and in the refutation of Master Plessis his answer: but he sheweth not how. And therefore the same is like to stand vntill such time, as he answereth better. Secondly, he saith, that Master Plessis was charged for alledging, that out of Cyril, that was not in Cyril. But if he speake of expresse terms, then is it denied, that Master Plessis alledged such words out of Cyril. Thirdly, he denieth, that Cyril obiected ignorance to Iulian for charging Christians for honoring the crosse. But the words of Cyril doe confirme

that

that we say, and refute not only Parsons his deniall, but also the Popish worship of the crosse. *Miseros esse ducit &c.* he saith they are miserable, saith Cyril, which haue care alwaies to signe their houses and forheads with the signe of the pretious crosse. And this he saith, doth procede of extreame ignorance. *Extremam sapere imperitiam.* And so this being referred to Iulians whole obiection, must nedes argue, that he shewed himselfe vnskilfull in the whole. Furthermore, it sheweth, that Christians did then only sign themselues with the Crosse, and not worship it. Lastly, he telleth vs, that Minutius Felix, where he saith Christians neither adored, nor desired crosses, meant gibets, and not the signe of the Crosse. But it had beene ridiculous to say, that Christians adored gibets. For this exception therefore let him haue the gibet which his manifold treasons deserue, and which he wisheth to others.

The 7. place pretended to be falsified, was taken out of an imperiall law alledged by Petrus Crinitus. The reason of the exception was, for that the words *humi & in solo*, that is, vpon the ground and pauement, are left out. But the matter is very easily answered. For, as I said before, Master Plessis cited the law aright out of Crinitus, and Crinitus seemeth to haue taken it out of most true copies. Reason also doth confirme the same. For if it had not beene lawfull to paint Christ, where any disgrace might haue beene offered vnto him, then should he not haue beene painted or carued on walles, where he might haue beene spit vpon, or in high waies, where beasts might rubbe their galled sides against it. Neither hath Parsons any other matter to alledge against Master Plessis for defence of his former relation, but that he cited the Lawe in the name of the Emperours. But as he mentioned the Code and Emperours; so he nameth his author, from whence he had it, and that not only in the margent, but in the booke. Wherfore leauing him, he runneth on me with open mouth, and the rather, for that while he went about to trippe others, he fell downe himselfe, and was taken in a grosse error, misciting the title of the law, and ioyning Iustinian the Emperor,

that liued long after, with Theodosius and Valens. Neither can he alledge for his excuse, that Iustinian brought these Lawes together into one Code. For that was not Parsons meaning in his relation, neither can the relator of a Law be better termed the maker of a Law, then Parsons the relater of the conference in France, a disputer. But saith Parsons, first it is false, that M. Plessis alledged Crinitus; and his reason is, for that the name of Crinitus is only in the margent. But if this reason were good, then should not Parsons cite scriptures or fathers, that for the most part are only noted in the margent. Furthermore it is untrue, that Crinitus is only quoted in the margent, as may appeare Pag. 256. of the bookes printed by Portau at Saumur.

He chargeth me also with vanity, for that I say Crinitus cited the Law out of authenticall records, and calleth me Iconoclast. But for the first, Crinitus himselfe, who is better to be beleeued, then this gloſing Parasite, shall discharge me. *Libitum est*, saith he, *verba ex libris Augustalibus referre, quo id totum melius innoteſcat.* That is, I thought good, to relate the words out of imperiall bookes, that the whole might be knowen better. Neither could he vnderstand the corrupt copies now sent vs out of Italy, where matters are a little otherwise reported, for then the whole should not haue beene better knowen, as he saith.

Thirdly, he denieth that Trebonian put in and put out at pleasure. But that is the complaint of diuers interpreters. Cuiacius in paratitlorum præf. saith, the Emperor would haue the digest called his, though he wrested and changed old Lawes, and had almost nothing of them remaining. And if Tribonia did not falsifie the law; yet some other forger might do it in fauour of the Pope, as he hath put the Lawe, *Inter claras*, among the imperial Lawes, the same not being found in old bookes, as Alciat testifieth lib. parerg. 5. c. 23.

Fourthly, he saith this law was not published by Theodosius and Valens, but by Theodosius the second and Valentinian the third. But he sheweth himselfe a shamelesse fellow without helpe of any witnesse to contradict, not Crinitus only,

but

but the title found in the Code. Neither were it materiall, if Valens were slaine before Theodosius reigned, seeing he was a famous commander in his time. But indeed, that which Parsons saith of Valens his death, 12. yeares before Theodosius his reigne, is an vntruth refuted by Baronius, as it seemeth, and by others.

Finally, he taxeth me, for that I mention not the canon of the councell of Eliberis, and the epistle of Epiphanius against Images, and saith that Eusebius, Hierome, Cyril, Prudentius, Paulinus, Gregory Nyssen, and Gregory Nazianzen allow the pious vse of Images. But first I had thought this fellow had not beene ignorant of the words of the 36. canon of Eliberis, and of the epistle of Epiphanius to Iohn Bishop of Hierusalem, wherein he sheweth, that he tooke downe a veile, that had the Image of Christ, or some saint in it. Further I must now tell him, that in one sentence he doth falsifie more Fathers, then either Eureux or he shall euer prooue to haue beene falsified by Master Plessis. For not one of these Fathers doe say, that the vse of Images is pious. Nor doth any one of them allow them for other vse then for history. This Idolatrous Popish parasite therefore may doe well to forbeare to raile against others, that condemne the wicked vse of Images, vnlesse he can defend Bellarmines foolish disputes, that stand refuted, and bring better stuffe, then this. It will be also more credit for him, to cease either his impostures and forgery, or else his clamours against falsifications. and as for my pleadings for M. Plessis they shall stand, when he shall not be able to maintaine his vaine and lying relations.

The eight place, being taken out of Bernard, is easily iustified. For it is apparant, that he doth not allow the honors, which Papists now giue to the Virgin Mary, celebrating her conception, as their missals and breuiaries testifie, with superlatiue honors. Neither is it materiall, that we doe not allow all Bernards priuate opinions concerning the worship of the holy Virgine, and other matters. For it were absurd to cast away the good, for that caried away with ꝑ streame of

customs, and blinded with the darkenesse, that in his time ouered the Church, he spoke corruptly sometimes, and erroneously. As for our allegations of Fathers they shall alwaies be iustified to be more sincere, then the allegations of Papists. In the meane while, I would intreat Mas Parsons to iustifie his owne allegations, which I haue shewed to be most false and foule. In the end he should haue answered for Eureux that decrieth the scriptures as insufficient, and cleared himselfe and his consorts condemned by Epiphanius for heretikes, for that they offer consecrated cakes in the honour of our Lady. But the first he passeth ouer with silence. For the second he referreth vs to Walpooles confutation, himselfe being glad to passe by such dangerous rockes. But neither shall his disciple, nor he himselfe cleare the Romish Synagogue of this blemish, as by my reply to Walpoole, God willing, shall euidently appeare.

In the ninth and last place Master Plessis is charged with two sleights, in alledging a place out of Theodoret in Psal. 113. The first, for that he translateth the Greeke word idole, by the Latine word Image. The second, for that he cutteth out these words, Idols adored by Pagans, and adored for Gods. But our answeres are such, as may satisfie any indifferent man, and doe stand, notwithstanding Parsons his vaine cauillations against them. For first εἴδωλον in Greeke is nothing else, but *Imago* in Latine. Iſay the 40. where the Latine interpreter hath *simulachrum*, the Greeke hath εἴδωλα. And Deut. 4. where the Latin translated *simulachrum*, the Greeke hath εἰκόνα. And this I said was to be confirmed by diuers good authors Greeke and Latine. But to all this, albeit malice thrust him on, yet his weakenesse would not suffer him to answer any thing. Now I must tell him further, that Ireney lib. 1. c. 23. & 24. condemneth Images as Idols. And Tertullian lib. de Idolatr. saith, that *omnis forma or formula, idolum se dici exposcit.* May Theodoret himselfe quæst. 38. in Exod. sheweth, that the commandement forbiddeth the adoration both of Idoles, and Images and similitudes *idolum nihil repræsentat*, saith he, *quod subsistat. similitudo*

tudo vero est alicuius imago & effigies &c. quæ omnia vetat adorare & colere. Atqui non temere prohibuit vtrumque. That is, an idole representeth nothing, that subsisteth; but a similitude is the image and forme of some thing, &c. all which (God) forbiddeth vs to adore and worship. And not without cause he forbad both. So we sée the vanitie of the man, that reprehendeth vs in that, wherein we haue so good authors for our warrant. In vaine also he reprehendeth our translations of scriptures, and braggeth of Gregory Martins discouery. For little doth he vnderstand what is right, what wrong in translating, that is ignorant both of Greeke and Hebrew, and Gregory Martins discouery is long since refuted by D. Fulke of reuerend memory, and so yet standeth.

To the second we said, that nothing was omitted fraudulently in Theodoret. And that we confirmed for that the words adored by the Gentils, did make for vs, & against the Papists, that worship their Images in the same sort, that the Gentils did, kissing them, crouching to them, praying before them, and burning incense to them. And to this Parsons durst not answer any thing. The sore was too grieuous to be touched.

To the first Parsons replieth, that if images of saints be idols, then all the ancient fathers are idolaters. And his reason is, for that Prudentius, Cassianus, Paulinus, Gregorius Nyssenus, Basil, Theodoret, Hierome, Gregorius Turanensis, Gregory the Great, Euagrius, Chrysostome, Bede, Damascene and others vsed Images with this honor, which he talketh of. But he doth in one sentence falsely alledge more fathers then in any one materiall cause of Popery he is able to alledge truly. And that shall appeare aswell by the Fathers words, which he durst not cite, as by our answers to Bellarmine.

To the second he replieth, that the words, *à gentibus culta*, containe the whole point of the controuersie. But in this point he sheweth that he answereth not worth a point. For vnlesse he can shew, that the Papists worship their Images with other worship, then the Pagans did theirs, the text of

Theodoret

Theodoret will stand in force against them, and that appeareth by Master Plessis last edition, where these words are set downe at the full, and forced against the Papists.

Thus we see, that in this point Master Plessis standeth cleared from vnsincere dealing. But Parsons alledging the words of the same author in Psalm. 113. doth notoriously adde to his words this clause, *& pro diis culta*, as if Theodoret had only condemned such images, as were taken and worshipped for Gods; which is neither written by him, nor can with any truth be alledged. For the Gentils expressly denied, that they toke their images for Gods.

We may also perceiue, that his lying relation with no colour of words, nor turnes of this Proteus can be defended. Might he not then, trow you, haue gained more by sleeping, then by his watching in writing these foleries?

It resteth now, that I answer his conclusion, as he calleth it; but a conclusion, like to his other conclusions, that hath no coherence with the premisses. For what, I beseech you, belongeth the contention betwixt one Philip Woodward a marked Masse-priest, and me, either to the treatise of three conuersions, or of Parsons his Almanakes and Calendars, or to his defence of his relation from Rome? Doth it follow, because Parsons talketh of three conuersions, and three halfpeny Almanackes and Calendars, and against Master Plessis and me, that he must also take vpon him the defence of Philip Woodward, who beginning a quarrell with me, and hauing receiued his answer, is sunke vnder the burthen, and lieth downe, *tanquam Canthersus in fossa*, that is, like a iade in a sluughe, and I thinke will appeare no more, vnlesse it be at Tiburne?

Thus you see, how vnfit his title is to his discourse. Now you shall also vnderstand that his discourse is yet farre more vnfitting and foolish then his title. The which, that it may be the better performed, I will first lay downe the occasions, and summe of Parsons his pleading, before I come to my answeare. And then I will speake to his person: but all briefely, for that neither the man, nor his matter is of any great

great worth. Some three yeeres agone and more, occasioned by the importunity of aduersaries, that armed with the title of Catholikes and calling themselues the Church, and challenging to themselues the name of the professors of the old religion, bid defiance to the true Church, and most true Catholikes, I made a challenge to them all, offering to proue that neither the modern Church of Rome is the true church, nor the Romists true Catholikes, nor their religion ancient. I shewed further, that Papists are heretikes, idolaters, and as many of them, as adhered to the Pope and his complices, Gunpowder-men and true traitors. To this litle was said of a long time. Only one Philip Woodward vnder the maske of E. O. began to cauill, as their manner is, at certaine allegations, and quotations, and to charge me with some vntruthes. Now also I vnderstand that W.R. alias Walpoole hath opposed himselfe to the challenge. But his confutation is rather a confirmation of my challenge, then otherwise, handling matters only in a generality, and not daring to come to particulars, as shall appear in my answer. But now to this wooden fellow, called Woodward. Hauing receiued his trifling pamphlet, I thought it conuenient, to iustifie my dealings in my challenge; which is done, and the party at a rest, and as mute as a codfish. Parsons therefore to supply his wants, thought best to say somewhat. But this somewhat is worse, then Woodwards nothing. First he diuideth my booke into 4. parts, but the least part is more, God wot, then he for his part durst vndertake to handle.

First, he telleth of the dedication of it to S. Robert Cecil, now for his seruice and merit made Earle of Salisbury. But to whom should I rather direct it, then to the Chancellor of that Vniuersity, whereof I am a member, and to a professor of that religion, which we teach, and one more iniured both in himselfe and his worthy father by Parsons, then by any man liuing? And this will appeare so long as any copy of Andreas Philopater, or of the libell entitled causes of pretended feares, or of other libels set out by Parsons principally against his father and himselfe, shalbe extant.

Secondly,

Secondly, he chargeth me with foolish vanting. As if it were either folly, or vanting to craue an answere to our whole treatises, and to complaine, how our aduersaries leauing off to handle whole questions, do quarrell about allegations, and impertinent matters, thereby to draw men from the cognition of more important and serious points of faith. I doe also challenge Parsons and all his disciples, and feare not the fiue or sixe bookes, that he talketh of. But yet not vpon any confidence of my owne strength, but rather vpon assurance of the cause, which I defend; which when Parsons either reeleth, or falleth, or hangeth, will stand.

Thirdly, he saith, that I accompt falsifications for trifles, and by-matters, and with this conceit maketh himselfe sport. But he is like the man, that both piped and danced himselfe. For these are none of my words, nor doth he report any part of my meaning. For I say only, and he doth report my sayings not far otherwise then I say, that our aduersaries contend with vs about small quirkes and questions, and certaine pretended vntruthes and falsifications. So any man may see, I make falsifications diuers from small quirkes and falsifications. And that our aduersaries pretend that, which they cannot find in our writings, but we find plentifully in theirs.

Fourthly, he laugheth at me when I alledge law, declaring himselfe not only a lawlesse fellow, but a block vncapable of the reasons of Law. I say, that where exceptions are taken to a law or pleading, the rest that is without the exception is confirmed. And this any man of reason would yelde vnto; but such a one as he, that is not capable of reason or law. May there is no question, but that Philip Woodward running ouer my whole challenge would haue taken exceptions to more places, if he could haue found any occasion of quarrell. And if Parsons speake to any point, it is because either his wit or the cause affordeth him no iust matter of exception. That therfore which he alledgeth of the difference of a priuat pleading, and a whole book, sheweth, that his skill is not great either in making the one, or the other.

Lastly,

Lastly, he maketh a iest at my words, where I aske, how true religion can be visible. But if he would doe himselfe and his disciple Woodward right, he should turne his laughter vpon him, that maketh true and Catholike religion visible. For truth and religion are matters of vnderstanding, and things Catholike and vniuersall cannot be perceiued with the eie, that is only capable of particulars. Neither is it materiall, that men that professe religion may be seene. For what man can tell by outward sight and view of the eie whether Parsons be a Turke, or a Iew, or a Papist: a Iebusit, or a Cananite? nay albeit a man see the Pope say Masse, yet can he not see, whether he beleeue in God or no. He therefore that laugheth at this, maketh a iest at God and religion, and matters of faith. But Parsons is a man, that indeed deserueth to be laughed at, or rather hissed out of schools, that would proue true religion not only by the popes triforked crowne, & Monks coules, but also by parliament robes, and kings coronations. And this is all, that the gibing vice hath to say against the first part of my booke.

Against the second part he hath nothing to obiect, but that one W. R. a terrible fellow, and a giant as big as Askapart hath published a briefe and cleare confutation of my challenge as he saith, and hath conuinced me of a multitude of errors, ignorances, lies and frauds. And wel he may speake what he hath done, for that I see he had a finger in this neate sote pie himselfe. But when he shall perceiue, how this poore snake hath confounded himselfe and his cause, & hath rather releeued then hurt his aduersary, being a most ignorant, railing dolt, and more vncapable, then Parsons; I hope he will leaue his vaine brags of this confutation. Let him therefore bestow a litle labour to read the canuasing of this dogbolt, and he shall soone abate much of his proud bragging humor.

Handling the 3. part he taketh vpon him to defend Philip Woodwards detection. And yet he confesseth, he hath neuer seene it. So it appeareth he speaketh of matters neuer seene, nor knowen. His first exception is to my stile, because sometime I giue termes such as the party deserueth, as ecstaticall,

call, lunatike, frantike, dolt and such like. But if he report my whole sentence where any of these words stand, he shall see, that they fall upon him of their owne accord, and are drawen upon himselfe by his owne folery. I could also shew that he requiteth me with like words, but I take them patiently, as so many alles throwes.

His second exception is to three points in my challenge, and said to be untruly affirmed by me in Woodwards detection. The first is, where I say, that the Papists vse exorcismes, blowings, salt, spittle, hallowed water, anointings, light, and diuers ceremonies in baptisme, neither vsed by the Apostles, nor practised by the ancient Church. This, Woodward affirmeth to be untruth. And his reasons are drawen from Caluin, Nazianzen, Origen and Ambrose. But either falsely alledged, or else impertinent to the purpose. And that Parsons himselfe cannot deny, answering nothing in iustification of the paltry dealing of his companion. I might also shew that the false Masse-priest misalledgeth my words. This then being this desperat fellowes cause, let vs see what defence this voluntary proctor is able to make for his forlorne client. First he saith, I begin with contrary interrogations, to wit, what if it be true, and what if it be not true? But he beginneth with his old practise of lying and calumniation, cutting off my words at pleasure, and making me to say that which I neither said nor euer thought. Woodward affirmeth that it is vntrue, which I said, and that Caluin doth confesse it. These two assertions I auoid by these two interrogations, what if it be true, viz. which I affirmed concerning Popish ceremonies in baptism. And what if it be vntrue that Caluin confesseth that, which I say to be vntrue? Implying, that the party had said vntruth in both. But either the dull pate of Parsons could not, or would not vnderstand so much. Secondly, rehearsing my answer to Caluin, and the fathers, he curtalleth my words, and maketh me to say matters neuer thought, and then crieth out loe here 3. or 4. holes. And againe, is not this a prety shift? And Thirdly, is not this a more silly shift? And Lastly, he telleth a tale of a scholar of Oxford and a statute,

tute that vpon paine of expulsion forbiddeth scholars to goe ouer the walles. All which is nothing but meere folery. For first, I do not yeld that Caluin confesseth these ceremonies to be very ancient. So that is one lye. Nert I doe not say, that the old Fathers and Doctors doe mention them in their writings. So that is a second lie. But did any one singuler father mention any one of these ceremonies, it doth not thereof follow, that the Church did practise either that ceremony, or the rest of these ceremonies. Lo here a piece of folery added to his falsity. Thirdly, I doe lesse say, that the fathers mention them as practised in the Church in their times, though Parsons maketh me to confesse this together with the rest. This therefore is a third lie. Lastly, I doe not say, that these ceremonies were in vse in the primitiue Church, as he pretendeth I doe. This is therefore a fourth lie. Beside lies also he bringeth in a false conclusion. For if one father mention one ceremony, and another doe mention another, yet seing all these ceremonies are not mentioned, either iointly, or seuerally by any father, or said to be practised in the Church; he cannot conclude, that they were allowed by the ancient Churches practise. For neither is euery singuler fathers opinion a sufficient testimony of the practise of the Church, nor doe wise Logicians conclude an vniuersal by particular propositions.

He would also gladly take away my answer to Caluins words. But beginning his discourse, he left not off his old fashion of lying. For he saith, I esteeme him perhaps more then the fathers, and seeme to be most troubled about him. Both are vntruthes. Nert he saith, I shuffle vpon Caluin also. But he sheweth himselfe a wooden disputer, that talking of shuffling and shifting cannot disproue any thing, which I say. Nay poore idiot, where both Caluin and I speake only of some of these ceremonies, he commeth in still with all his trash, and yet hath no euidence, but our words, which make nothing for him.

Secondly, I say, that the doctrine of the conuenticle of Trent, that denounceth all accursed, that hold not baptisme

to

to be necessary to salvation is not Catholike. And to this Woodward take exception, but proved nothing. Let vs then consider, if his assistant or Master Parsons can help him any thing. First then, he saith, that baptisme is necessary, *re vel voto*. But that exception is not added by them of Trent. Further this exception iustifieth our assertion, viz. that all are not damned, that are not baptized: and it may further be proued by children, which being brought to be baptized die before they obtaine it. For these committing no contempt, who will say they are damned? Neither doe either the fathers, or the Church of England, hold otherwise. Next, because I stand vpon these words, let them be accursed, he crieth out againe, What a peece of foolery is this? But all the folery was in his owne braine. For albeit some haue beleeued, that baptisme is so necessary, that all that are not baptised are damned, yet none did euer accurse them, that followed a milder sentence against such, as committed no contempt. And that is the principal point for which I charge the conuenticle of Trent with vncatholike doctrine. Parsons saith, the same curse was denounced in the councel of Mileuis and Carthage and by Innocent the first, as Augustine testifieth epist. 90. 92. & 93. But he lieth of both those councels; and bringeth forth counterfet epistles, whereof one was written not by Saint Augustine, but by another. He maketh vs beleeue, he hath not his aduersaries treatise. But that sheweth his owne rashnesse, that pleadeth for a man and a case vnknowen. Where I say, that Saint Augustine lib. 3. de orig. animæ. c. 9. doth speake of such as die in originall sin, and seeme to contemne baptisme: he saith, it is the most blockish refuge, that could be imagined. But if this blocke had thought, that Saint Augustine was driuen to teach the absolute necessity of baptisme, and that for remedy of originall sinne against the Pelagians and others; he would haue seene, where other remedies may be deuised, that he needed not to stand vpon the absolute necessity of baptisme. I confesse, I might haue said, that this was Saint Augustines particular opinion, and that it was no more to be followed, then where

where he teacheth the neceſſity of receiuing the Lords ſupper. He vrgeth alſo the words of the communion booke and mine owne words: but he doth only relate that, which is formerly anſwered. Finally, he ſuppoſeth this argument to be concludent, want of baptiſme ſendeth infants to hell, *ergo*, all that are not baptized, are damned. And ſuppoſeth me to be a ſleepe for denying it. But he was a ſleepe, or rather his reaſon was tied when he ſaid, that Phyſicke is abſolutely neceſſary to him that dieth for want of Phyſicke. My anſwer was very reaſonable. For albeit a lame man could not go to ſee his friend for want of a horſe, yet is not a horſe abſolutely neceſſary. But this horſe-diſputer is not capable of reaſon.

The third place Parſons toucheth not. Perceiue he ſaw me vniuſtly charged, and thought therefore beſt to ſkip ouer it; neither had he ſkip-iack more reaſon to inſiſt vpon the fourth. For true it is, that Maſſes and prayers and ſpeciall offices for the dead were neuer frequented by true Catholikes. But he being touched in his freehold, thought it neceſſary to ſlubber ouer ſome defence for his ſoule Maſſes, that are the life of ſoule-prieſts. And firſt he denieth that the controuerſie betwixt the Papiſts and vs is about ſpeciall offices for the dead, or the Maſſe of *requiem æternam*. And becauſe I except firſt againſt them, he crieth to his fellowes and ſaith, doe you ſee which way the hare will goe away. But if hee anſwere no better, though by vertue of his three conuerſions he turne himſelfe into a hare, yet ſhal he neuer be able to runne from vs. For if there be no controuerſie about theſe matters betwixt vs, then muſt he yeeld to vs in offices for the dead, and in his maſſe of *requiem*.

Furthermore were he diſpoſed to yeeld in his priuat Maſſes, and thoſe of *requiem*; yet ſhall he neuer make good the reſt. For neither ſhall he proue, that the ancient fathers did beleeue, that the body and blood of Chriſt was really offered in the euchariſt for quicke and dead, nor can he make his canon good by the teſtimony of fathers. Nay the very words of the canon are much repugnant to the moderne doctrine of the

Masse. Chrysostome and Augustine, as I said other where, doe mention sacrifice and praier for the dead. But it was only a commemoration of their names, and not an expiation for their sinnes. The like may be said of Epiphanius and other fathers.

Secondly, he endeavoureth to take away my answere to the fathers, that mention oblations, or praiers for the dead. And telleth vs, how Chrysostome saith, that much gaine and profit commeth to them thereby. But the gaine which he speaketh of is not remission of sinnes, nor ease in Purgatory. Not the first, for that he alloweth oblations for Martyrs. *Licet Martyres sint, tamen pro Martyribus offertur*, saith he Homil. 21. in Act. that is, albeit they be Martyrs, yet sacrifice is offered for Martyrs. Likewise he allowed praiers for the damned in epist. ad Philip. Homil. 3. *Lugeamus peccatores.* Let vs, saith he, mourne for sinners. Afterward he saith, let vs helpe them. And this he saith will pacifie Gods wrath. *Placabit hoc deum.* But the good deede not, the wicked cannot obteine remission of sinnes there. Not the second, for that the Greekes reiect Purgatory, as Marcus Eptusius saith in Apolog. Græc. and Sixtus Senensis biblioth. lib. 6. annot. 259. confesseth, and Chrysostomes words are plaine in Homil. 3. in epist. ad Philip. Where he saith, that iust men whether liuing or dead are with Christ. That therefore which I say, that Chrysostome was vncertaine, what good praiers did to the dead, is most true: and most simple are the Papists, that vrge his testimony, neither praying after their humor for the dead, nor beleeuing Purgatory, as they teach it.

Concerning Epiphanius and Augustine, that number Arius among heretikes for denying the ancient order of the Church in the commemoration of the dead, and making oblations for them, he asketh me first, why we should not now likewise be deemed heretikes for denying the same. To which I answer, for that the Christian Church of our times hath for diuers abuses abrogated the same. Next he saith, that all this is shamefull shifting, turning and winding of a leud and

loose

loose conscience. And why? forsooth saith he, because the words of Epiphanius and Saint Augustine are most plaine and euident, that Ærius was condemned of heresie for denying praiers and sacrifices to be offered for the dead. But what if neither of the two haue any such plaine and euident words? willit not then appeare, that these are termes fitting a shameleſſe leud lozell, and the humor of a railing rascall? It cannot be denied. But he shall neuer be able to shew, that either the one or the other hath any such plaine words. But of Epiphanius he bringeth a testimony, that Ærius was a great plague of the world, furious in mind, and proud in opinion. But what is that to the words mentioned? Beside that, both of them recken him among heretikes. But whether of them affirme, that for this matter only he was so cruell accompted of, and condemned for an heretike? Nay Epiphanius seemeth to condemn those, that trust in praier for the dead, hæres. 75. *Si preces eorum, qui hic sunt, prosint illis, qui isthic sunt, igitur nemo sit pius, &c.* that is, if the praiers of the liuing profit the dead, then let no man liue godly, or doe good workes, but get friends to pray for him. Furthermore neither doth Augustine, nor Epiphanius speake one word of the blasphemous oblation of Papists, that beleeue, that the priest offereth the very body and blood of Christ for the dead, nor doe they any thing fauour the wicked praiers of Papists in their offices, and Masses for the dead, that by the merit of their sacrifices and the intercession of saints and indulgences pray for remission of sinnes in Purgatory. He alledgeth also a testimony out of Epiphanius hæres. 75. and Augustine enchirid. c. 110. and tract. 80. in Ioan. And for a supply addeth certaine words out of Cyril. catech. myst. 5. and Basils liturgy. But no one of these proueth either those blasphemous oblations, which the polesworne Priests of Baal offer for the dead, nor the formes practised in the Romish Synagogue. Nay both Epiphanius & Austine in the places mentioned shew, that praiers are made both for the good, and for the bad, which is contrary to the Popish practise, which is to pray for soules in Purgatory, and to pray to Saints in Hea-

nen, and not once to thinke to helpe the damned. Cyril, and Augustine tract. 84. in Ioan. haue not one word of praying to saints, though without shame this shamelesse fellow affirme it; but suppose, that they in generall pray for vs, being mentioned in the celebration of the eucharist. Basils liturgy is counterfet, and yet maketh it nothing for Parsons. Finally, he obiecteth Master Calvins words, lib. instit. 3. c. 5. §. 10. and Master Willets confession against me. But in citing of Calvins words, he cutteth off the beginning, that sheweth that this was the obiection of the aduersary, *cum mihi obijciunt aduersarij quod ante mille & trecentos annos vsu receptum fuit, vt precationes fierent pro defunctis &c.* Likewise he misliketh that I should say, that speaking of praiers for the dead, Master Calvin and Master Willet should meane the commemoration of the dead. But his quarrell proceedeth of very little ground. For how could they meane other praiers for the dead, seeing no other was vsed?

Little cause therefore hath Parsons to make such outcries against falshoodes, fraudes, sleights, contradictions and impudencies. For my answeres are strong, and my exceptions peremptory. And although he vseth all manner of fraud, sleight, and falshood; yet preuaileth he nothing. For his primat Walles he is able to say nothing. For the Walles of Requiem, the Walle-priests may sing a requiem. For they are in Parsons his opinion, dead. Thirdly, he abandoneth Walles in honour of the Crosse, and of our Lady. Fourthly, he proueth not, that the fathers did know, or teach, that Christs bodie and blood were offered really by the Priest for quicke and dead: for their oblations which they mention, were only commemorations, almes and praiers of thankesgiuing. Fifthly, being charged, that the ordinall of the Romish Church had in old time no praiers for the dead, he passeth the matter ouer in silence. Sixthly, he hath nothing to say for the formes of praier vsed for the dead by the synagogue of Rome. 7. he belieth Cyril and Basil. 8. he vrgeth Epiphanius and Augustine and Chrysostome, that testifie nothing either against vs, or for him. Lastly, he taketh an obiection out of Caluin for his resolution.

lution. Are not then the Papists much abused, who depend vpon the Pope, which by no sleight or falshood can be defended? And doe they trust in Parsons his defence, that in one point hath vsed so many sleights and falsehoodes, and yet betraied the maine cause of his clients?

Concerning the fourth part he hath little to say for himself. He telleth of diuers falsifications obiected against the Popes of Rome, against Bellarmine, Baronius, and himselfe. But we looked rather for answer, then recapitulation of our charge. I cannot compare him more fitly to any, then to a bragging fencer, that taking diuers blowes single on his pate, cried out for his defence at euery rappe, well stricken. But it had beene better, if he had shewed how well he could haue defended, and warded the blowes.

In the end of his treatise he taketh vpon him to censure my writings, and to tel what matters he hath further to obiect against me, either for deedes or sayings, in Ireland at Castle Cary, and Dublin, or at Exeter on the bouling greene, or in other places; and in the end talketh of my conclusion against Masse-priests and Iebusites. But for the first he doth it without commission. For neither he, nor any of his side is to censure my writings, nor we his; but both his writings and mine are to be censured by indifferent readers, which I doubt not will doe it according to right. For the second, let him not spare. The worst he can say is, that I professe my selfe an enemy of such, as he is one of his Powdermen, that are enemies of their Prince and country. His instructions are very false, his obiections vaine and trifling. When I come vpon him I will obiect no such trifles, but plaine impieties and treasons. There in the end of his booke he applieth that which is spoken of Christ concerning the breaking of the serpents head to Bellarmine and Baronius: For which he deserueth to haue his Asses head combed with a cudgell. Finally I pitty the Masse-priest, and conclude nothing against them, vnlesse they include themselues among the number of publike enemies, and false traitors, as all lets they haue done notoriously.

God grant both him and them grace, to see their former offences, and to consider how wilfully they haue maintained the cause of enemies against their Prince and Country, of Heresie against truth, of Antichrist against Christ Iesus; that all partiall affection laid aside, we may all of vs in the end agree in one Apostolicall faith and truth, and leauing off al ambition and ostentation may sincerely seeke the saluation both of our owne soules, and of all Christians, of whom we professe our selues teachers.

Laus Deo.

XUM

XUM

A breefe note of the Contents of euery Chapter of this threefold Answer.

The Contents of the first Booke.

Chap. 1. A Defence of *M. Wickliffe, Sir Roger Acton*, and other godly Martyrs and Confessors referred in the Calender for the time of their sufferings or triall to the Moneth of Ianuary.

Chap. 2. A defence of *Sir Ioh. Oldcastle, M. Onley, M. Luther, M. Rogers*, and other Martyrs and Confessors referred to the Moneth of February.

Chap. 3. A defence of the most reuerend father and holy Martyr Archbishop *Cranmer, M. Bilney*, and other holy men, who in the calender before *M. Foxes* booke are referred to the Moneth of March.

Chap. 4. An answer to *Parsons* his spiteful notes vpon the Acts of Martyrs and Confessors set out by *M. Fox*, and in the Calender referred to the Moneth of Aprill.

Chap. 5. Of the Martyrs and Confessors registred and ranged in the Moneth of May.

Chap. 6. Of the Martyrs and Confessors of Christs truth against Popery, referred in the calender to the Moneth of Iune.

The Contents of the second Booke.

Chap. 1. THe examination of the doctrine and acts of Martyrs, and others registred in old Calenders and Martyrologies of Papists, and worshipped by them in the Moneth of Ianuarie.

Chap. 2. Of the faith and acts of Romish saints calendred in the Moneth of February.

Chap. 3. Of the Romish saints mentioned and worshipped in the calender of the Moneth of March.

Chap. 4. Of Saints calendred by the Romanists in the Moneth of April.

Chap. 5. Obseruations and collections out of the former discourse concerning Calenders.

Chap. 6. That the Papists doe honor diuers saints which either neuer were in the world, or else are not certainly knowen to be such as they are reported.

Chap. 7. That Papists worship for saints some that were Pagans, others that were Iews in religion and refused Christ, diuers that were either heretikes or traitors, or at least wicked men, and many of whose faith in earth, and saluation in heauen they haue no certeinty.

Chap. 8. That the Papists doe often times worship counterfet and false reliques of saints.

Chap. 9. That the Legends of saints are full of lies and fooleries.

Chap. 10. That S. *Peter*, and other Apostles, and Martyrs, & holy men of ancient times, albeit registred in the Roman Calenders & Martyrologies, yet were no way acquainted with that faith or worship of God, or Saints, and that Popish tyrannie which the Church of England now refuseth.

Chap.

XUM

Chap. 11. That the worship of saints & Angels practised in the Romish church is impious and vnlawfull.
Chap 12. That the Popish inuocation of Angels and saints is contrary to Christian religion, and sauoreth not only of impiety, but also of foolery.

The Contents of the third Booke.

Chap. 1. OBseruations vpon the title and front of *Parsons* his booke, and vpon his Epistle dedicatory.
Chap. 2. *Parsons* his notes of heretiks suffering obstinatly for their opinions, and the testimonies of fathers brought by him to proue the same, returned vpon himselfe, and his consorts.
Chap. 3. The foolery and absurdity of *Parsons* his directions for the vse of his double calendar.
Chap. 4. The nature and reason of calendars, and therein of the calendar prefixed before *Master Foxes* booke of Acts and Monuments, and of *Robert Parsons* his friuolous cauils against it.
Chap. 5. *Parsons* his idle talke concerning the making of calendars, and honors giuen in time past to Martyrs, is examined.
Chap. 6. A briefe reiection of *Parsons* his notorious lies and slanders exam. cap. 3. concerning 9. supposed sects, vnto which he indeuoreth to referre true Christians.
Chap. 7. *Parsons* his cauils against the constancy of Christian Martyrs suffering for the defence of truth against the Papists.
Chap. 8. A Calendar of *Parsons* his grosse lies and false allegations of authors contained throughout his examen.
Chap. 9. A note of certaine eminent fooleries and ignorances

rances appearing in the 3 part of his treatise of the 3 conuersions of England.

Chap. 10. A briefe collection of *Parsons* his testimonies, allegations, and arguments making against himselfe, his consorts, and their cause.

Chap. 11. An answer to *Parsons* railing and reuiling termes.

Chap. 12. A reply vpon *Parsons* his defence of his late relation from Rome; concerning the conference betwixt the L. of *Plessis Marli*, and *M. Peron* pretended Bishop of *Eureux*, together with an answer to his conclusion concerning a like course taken by *Ph. Woodward* to a challenge set out against the Iebusites and all their complices.